DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 885 IR 009 799

AUTHOR Kamhi, Michelle Marder
TITLE Book and Materials Selection for School Libraries and Classrooms: Procedures, Challenges and Responses. Working Report on Nationwide Survey.
SPONS AGENCY American Library Association, Chicago, Ill.; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, Va.; Association of American Publishers, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 4 Dec 80
NOTE 93p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; *Books; *Censorship; Controversial Issues (Course Content); Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Materials; Librarians; *Library Material Selection; National Surveys; Policy; *Public Schools; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS American Library Association; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Devel; Association of American Publishers; Library Procedures

ABSTRACT

Nationwide surveys were administered to public administrators and librarians at the building and district levels in public elementary and secondary schools, and mail and phone surveys of textbook officers in the 22 states with statewide adoption procedures, to gather data on challenges to library and instructional materials. Specific information sought concerned: (1) materials selection procedures and policies for public school classrooms and libraries; (2) the nature, extent, and magnitude of challenges to these materials and to selection policies and procedures; (3) how these challenges have been resolved; and (4) the affect of resolutions challenges on curriculum content, materials selection, and teaching methodology. Responses received from 25 percent of the approximately 7200 public administrators and librarians responding were selected to represent the four main geographic regions of the United States and adoption nonadoption states. Selected questions were cross tabulated. In addition to mail and phone surveys, 19 of the 21 textbook officers sent copies of state regulations and/or guidelines on books and materials selection. Questions and a summary of the responses to the surveys are provided, as well as three tables and two appendices. (RBF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED208835

BOOK AND MATERIALS SELECTION FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIES AND CLASSROOMS: PROCEDURES, CHALLENGES, AND RESPONSES

Working Report on Nationwide Survey

Sponsored by AAP, ALA, and ASCD

Michelle Marder Kamhi

December 4, 1980

IR009799

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard P. Kleeman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Contents

	Introduction	i
	Overview of Survey Results	vi
Part I	Summary of Responses to Questionnaire for School Administrators and Librarians	1
Part II	Summary of Responses to Questionnaire for State-Adoption Administrators	53
Appendix A	Letter to AAP from State-Adoption Administrator	73
Appendix B	Sample List of Titles challenged during a recent Statewide Social Studies Adoption	74

List of Tables

Table I	Categories of Respondents in Survey Sample and Return Compared to National Population	v
Table II	Survey Sample and Return Compared to National Population by Geographic Region and Adoption Category	16
Table III	Public School Enrollment in States with Statewide Adoption Procedures	58

BOOK AND MATERIALS SELECTION FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIES AND CLASSROOMS:

PROCEDURES, CHALLENGES, AND RESPONSES

Working Report on Nationwide Survey

Sponsored by AAP, ALA, and ASCD

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the nationwide survey, as stated in letters sent to the sample population prior to the mailing of survey questionnaires, was to gather data on the following:

- the range of procedures and policies currently followed in selecting textbooks and other instructional materials for public school classrooms and libraries;
- the nature, extent, and magnitude of challenges to these books and materials, and to the selection procedures and policies;
- the way in which such challenges have been resolved; and
- the ways in which the resolutions of such challenges have affected curriculum content, materials selection, and teaching methodology.

The survey was conducted in two parts: a large-scale nationwide mail survey of public school administrators and librarians on the local level; and a two-phase mail/phone survey of textbook officers in the 22 states with statewide adoption procedures.

Mail Survey of Local Administrators and Librarians

In April 1980, questionnaires were mailed to approximately 5,000 administrators and 2,500 librarians at the building and district levels in public elementary and secondary schools in the 50 states and the District of Columbia (exact numbers: 2,482 principals, 2,498 superintendents, 1,249 building-level librarians, and 1,342 library-supervisors).

Survey Sample

The sample was deliberately weighted toward superintendents, because it was felt that, of the four groups, they would have broadest access to the information sought and would be likeliest to respond to a lengthy, detailed questionnaire.

Sample selection was by means of the proportional stratified sampling technique. The number of school districts of each size sampled per state was in proportion to the total number of districts of that size in the state, with the proviso that, wherever possible, each state be represented by at least one administrative unit for each of the following enrollment categories: 100-299, 300-599, 600-999, 1,000-2,999, 3,000-4,999, 5,000-9,999, 10,000-24,999, and 25,000 and up (units with enrollments less than 100 were not included in the survey). An additional constraint on sample selection was that no more than one school library and media center could be included from a given school district.

The mailing was addressed to individuals by name. Very few questionnaires were returned to the sender as undeliverable; the mailing list was therefore judged to be accurate and up-to-date.

Questionnaire Design

Two questionnaires were prepared, one for administrators and one for librarians. (District- and building-level questionnaires within each group were differentiated only by color.) Questions related to (1) the selection process; (2) challenges to materials or to the selection process; (3) the resolution of challenges; and (4) repercussions of challenges.

Administrators' questionnaires pertained to both classroom and library materials. Librarians' questionnaries pertained almost exclusively to library materials. To maximize comparability of data from the two survey groups, the wording of questions on both instruments was deliberately kept very similar. The great majority of questions were virtually identical. A few questions differed substantially, to apply specifically to the library or classroom situation.

To ensure a good return, a pre-letter was mailed about one week in advance of the questionnaire, and a follow-up post card was sent about one week after the questionnaire. The only material incentive offered in the questionnaire cover letter was a copy of the final report on the study.

Comparison with Other Recent Surveys of Materials Selection and Censorship

This survey was far broader in scope than either the 1976 Educational Research Service (ERS) survey on instructional materials selection or the 1977 National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) censorship survey.

The ERS "Survey of Textbook and Instructional Materials Selection Procedures" was limited to school districts in the 33 "open" states (i.e. states without statewide adoption lists for school books) and the District of Columbia. It did not include districts in the "adoption" states (17 by their count, 22 by the AAP's), although varying degrees of selection take place at the local level even in these states. (Adoption states generally publish multiple listings, from which the local educational agencies then choose materials for their schools.) Nor did the ERS survey address librarians or principals.

Only one question on the ERS instrument dealt with challenges: "Has your school district recently had a problem with persons or groups in your community objecting to or challenging the appropriateness of (a) textbooks and instructional materials? (b) supplementary materials? IF YES, when was the last time that such an objection or challenge occurred?"

Finally, ERS's sample was quite small. Of the 1,275 school districts sampled, 414 responded.

The 1977 NCTE censorship survey dealt only with censorship, not with the initial selection process, and was limited to secondary school teachers of English who were Council members. Librarians were therefore not included in the survey sample. Several items on the questionnaire did relate to library materials, however. While somewhat larger than the ERS sample, the NCTE sample was still much smaller than ours. Out of 2,000 questionnaires mailed by NCTE, 630 were completed and returned.

Returns

In our study, a total of 1,891 questionnaires were completed by respondents and returned in time to be processed for computer analysis. (Additional questionnaires trickled in after the cutoff date.) The overall rate of return was just over 25 percent. (This compares favorably with the NCTE survey return rate of 30 percent, especially when one considers the basic differences in the populations surveyed.) The rate of return was highest for all district-level respondents (approximately 30 percent), somewhat lower for principals (23.2 percent), and lowest for building-level librarians (13.6 percent). (Table I shows the survey sample compared to the national population.)

One can only speculate on the reasons for the differing rates of return. Did some district-level administrators delegate the chore of completing the questionnaire to another staff member? Were building-level respondents, especially librarians, unable to find time for this extra paperwork toward the end of the school year? Or were school librarians perhaps reluctant to respond to a questionnaire touching on areas in which (as indicated by responses to a number of questions in the survey) they are highly vulnerable?

With regard to the possibility of selective nonresponse, it should be noted that one questionnaire was returned to the AAP completely blank except for the Island Trees School District seal stamped at the top.

Clearly, as expected, the length of the instrument was a deterrent to some individuals. (One irate nonrespondent sent back a blank questionnaire with this scribbled note: "Give this to someone with more time to waste than I have!")

Methods of Analysis

All multiple-choice responses were tallied by computer. In addition to totals for each of the four groups of respondents, totals for the four main geographic regions (Northeast, South, Midwest, West) and for adoption/ nonadoption states were obtained on all questions. Cross-tabulations of the data from selected questions were also obtained, to test the interrelatedness of certain key factors. Some of the most interesting results of the survey emerged from this analysis. See the discussion below, under "Cross-Tabulated Responses."

Much valuable information is contained in the write-in responses on the questionnaire. These have yet to be tabulated and interpreted. Because of the length and complexity of the questionnaire and the quanitity of data gathered, research efforts have focused on analysis of the computer-tabulated responses. It would be unfortunate, however, if some time were not devoted to a consideration of the write-in items before the conclusion of the study.

Table I

Categories of Respondents in Survey Sample and Return Compared to National Population

Group	National Population	Mail Sample N	Mail Sample % of National Population	Return N	Return % of National Population
Principals	100,455	2,482	2.5%	576	0.6%
Superintendents	16,000	2,498	15.6%	738	4.6%
Librarians	44,242	1,249	2.8%	170	0.4%
Library-Supervisors	37,738	1,343	3.6%	407	1.1%
Total	198,455	7,572	24.5%	1,891	6.7%

OVERVIEW OF SURVEY RESULTS

Responses to all questions in the local and state-level mail surveys are summarized in the body of this report (beginning on page 1 below), along with brief comments on salient results. What follows here is but a brief overview of the findings.

Mail Survey of Local Administrators and Librarians

Extent of Recent Challenges

Nearly 20 percent of the administrators reported that there had been challenges to instructional or library materials in their schools during the period since September 1, 1978. Nearly 30 percent of the librarians reported challenges to library materials in the same period. (The positive response rate for the two groups combined was 22.4 percent.) Few respondents in either group (6.9 percent of the administrators; 4.6 percent of the librarians) reported challenges to the selection process during the specified period.

How do these rates compare with those reported in earlier studies? Of the 414 district-level respondents to the ERS survey, 26.3 percent indicated they had had recent "challenges or objections" to instructional or supplementary materials. That figure is almost seven points higher than the 19.4 percent rate reported by administrators from the "open" states in the present survey. One factor may be that the term "challenges," the only term used in the AAP-ALA questionnaire, can imply graver problems than mere "objections."

Like the ERS questionnaire, the NCTE instrument used the term "objections." The key question in the NCTE survey read: "Have you or teachers in your department, since September 1, 1975, and the present [sic], had objections to a book or book title you are using?"

The NCTE survey reported substantially higher rates of censorship than the present survey. To quote the report by Lee Burress: "Approximately 49 percent of the returns indicated some kind of attempted or completed censorship, when all four basic categories are considered. If book censorship alone is considered, the 1977 survey shows that slightly over 30 percent of the returns reported book censorship pressures."

Essential differences between the populations surveyed undoubtedly contributed to the disparity between the NCTE and AAP-ALA survey results. As the responses to our own survey indicate, library materials, upper grade materials, and contemporary fiction and nonfiction trade books (which are quite widely used in high school English classes) are particularly susceptible to censorship. Our sample, however, did not include classroom teachers, was skewed toward administrators rather than librarians, and was somewhat skewed toward lower rather than upper grades. In addition, a substantial number of challenges reported in the NCTE survey related to school publications (newspapers and creative writing publications), which were not specifically addressed in the principal items on our questionnaire.

Of the respondents reporting challenges in the specified period, 250 out of 494, or slightly over 50 percent, indicated (question 4) that the rate of challenges since September 1, 1978, was about the same as in the preceding two-year period. Over a fourth (26.5 percent) of the respondents reporting challenges indicated that the recent rate is higher, while just under 10 percent reported it is lower. Overall, 13.8 percent of those responding to this question indicated they were uncertain of the trend.

Impact of Recent Challenges

Respondents were asked (question 5) if any of the challenges since September 1, 1978, had resulted in changes in the materials used or in the educational process or environment. In all, of the 510 respondents who completed this item, 29.4 percent indicated YES. Among librarians, the percentage was somewhat higher: 33.7 percent, compared with 26.8 percent of the administrators. The highest positive response was from building-level librarians (37.8 percent).

Responses from administrators indicating which educational aspects had been affected by recent challenges also pointed up the vulnerability of school libraries. The frequency with which various aspects were cited by administrators ranked as follows: library materials (32.7 percent), supplementary classroom materials (17.9), textbooks (11.5), materials selection procedure (11.1), materials selection policy (8.1), curriculum content (5.8), teaching methodology (4.7), personnel (3.0), and extracurricular activities (0.4).

Policies and Procedures

The librarians' and administrators' groups responded quite differently on questions relating to formal written policies governing materials selection. Of 565 librarians responding, nearly three-fourths (74.3 percent) indicated that the school or district they serve has its own written policy governing the selection of library materials. Fewer than half of the administrators (49.1 percent) reported that they had formal policies governing instructional materials selection. The spread was even greater in the two groups' responses to the question of whether they had formal written procedures for the reconsideration of challenged materials: 76.8 percent of the responding librarians indicated YES, as compared to 49.1 percent of the administrators. The disparity here may well be due to the ALA's continuing vigorous efforts to encourage their members to institute formal policies and procedures.

Respondents were asked to send copies of their selection policies and procedures to the AAP. In all, 381 respondents (196 administrators and 185 librarians) indicated that they would do so. After a cursory examination the materials received were forwarded, for more detailed review, to the Office for Intellectual Freedom of the ALA in Chicago. The wide range of policies and procedures cannot be detailed within the limited scope of this Overview.

With regard to the selection process, over half of the principals (58.1 percent) and superintendents (53.9 percent) reported that the school or district they administer has its own instructional materials selection committee.

Out of 1,261 administrators responding, 1,067 (84.6 percent) indicated that publishers' representatives had an opportunity at the reviewing stage to explain materials to the committee or individuals responsible for evaluation and selection.

Characteristics of Recent Challenges

Respondents were asked a whole series of questions relating to challenges since September 1, 1978. Some of the most significant responses are summarized here.

In reply to the question, In the period since September 1, 1978, what kinds of instructional or library items have been challenged in your school(s)? the items most frequently cited by administrators and librarians combined ranked as follows (by percentage of total responses): contemporary fiction (36.8 percent), textbooks (11.5), nonfiction trade (8.6), children's picture books (7.5), fiction classics (7.2), magazines (6.2), and 16 mm. educational films (5.5).

Based on the sum of responses from librarians and administrators, the "objectionable aspects" most often alleged by challengers in the stipulated period ranked as follows (by percentage of total responses): "dirty words" (14.5 percent), obscenity (11.6), explicit representation of sex (8.3), profanity (6.9), and sexism (4.7), with a whole range of other issues cited, though less often. In general, the responses were roughly comparable to those reported in the NCTE survey.

On the question Who initiated the challenge? respondents indicated that for 304 out of 390 (77.9 percent) of the challenged items reported on, the challenge was initiated by an individual representing him/herself. In 22.1 percent of the cases, the challenge was reported to be initiated by a group or an individual representing a group. Most often the challenger cited was a parent (in 52.3 percent of the cases overall). However, parents were cited more frequently by administrators (60.8 percent of total cases) than by librarians (44.0 percent). Librarians cited building-level administrators and teachers as initiating the challenge in 10.2 and 12.0 percent of the cases, respectively.

With respect to the censorship issue, one of the key questions in the survey asked: Which did the challenger(s) seek to do: Expand the information and viewpoints in the materials used and/or introduce new points of view, or Limit the information and viewpoints in the materials used? The vast majority of respondents on the local level indicated that challengers most often sought to censor rather than to expand materials used in the schools. Censorship pressures were reported to be highest by building-level librarians, who indicated that all of the challenges which they reported on for the period since 9/1/78 sought to "limit the information and viewpoints in the materials used." (The figure for the administrators' group was 93.4 percent and for the library-supervisors, 95.6 percent.)

Another crucial question, with regard to censorship, asked: Was the challenged material altered, restricted, or removed prior to a formal review? Overall, respondents answered YES in exactly 50 percent of the cases. The affirmative response rate was higher at the building level (55.6 percent for the principals, 66.7 percent for the librarians) than at the district level (40.1 percent for the superintendents, 53.0 percent for the library-supervisors). But, as can be seen from the above figures, librarians as a group reported a higher frequency (55.0 percent) of such arbitrary or peremptory censorship than did administrators (45.4 percent).

The regional breakdown of responses to this question was also significant. Among respondents from the South, the rates of affirmative response (65.9 percent in the administrators' group and 76.1 percent in the librarians') were considerably higher than among respondents nationwide.

Also fundamental to the censorship issue was the following question: What was the final disposition of the incident with regard to the challenged material? Respondents indicated that in over a third (34.6 percent) of the 513 recent incidents reported on the challenge was overruled, but in more than a fifth (22.2 percent) of the cases, the challenged material was removed from the school. In 2.7 percent of the cases, the challenged material was destroyed; in 1.9 percent, the "objectionable" material was cut, edited, or marked out.

Cross-Tabulated Responses

When one considers the issue of challenges to textbooks and other instructional materials, a number of basic questions arise concerning the factors which contribute to such challenges. Do schools with formal selection policies and reconsideration procedures have fewer challenges, for example? Are they more successful at resolving challenges without damage to the educational environment? Are urban, suburban, or rural communities more prone to challenges? Does their resolution of challenges vary? Does the profile of challenges differ in schools or districts of large vs. small enrollment?

These are just a few of the questions on which cross-tabulations of the survey responses were based. Several relationships emerged which may be significant--although they cannot be considered "correlations" in the strict statistical sense of the term.

Policies and Procedures--The percentage of respondents reporting recent challenges was consistently higher (in some cases double) among those who indicated that they have formal selection policies, reconsideration procedures, and a good public relations program. (Positive responses to questions 16-A/17-L, 22-A/21-L, and 23-A/24-L were considered indicators of a sound community relations effort.) Thus formal policies and procedures do not appear to deter challenges.

What is perhaps more significant is that administrators reporting no formal written selection policy (which is likely to entail no reconsideration procedures as well--see the comments on survey questions 7 and 8, pp. 9-10 below) more often reported (1) that recent challenges were dealt with informally(77.8 percent): (2) that the challenged material was censored prior to a formal review (58.9 percent); and (3) that the challenged material was ultimately removed from the school (30.2 percent). (The respective rates for administrators reporting that they do have formal selection policies were 52.5 percent, 40.9 percent, and 17.4 percent.)

The corresponding percentages for librarians without formal selection policies were 81.1 percent, 64.7 percent, and 23.4 percent; with policies, 57.4 percent, 54.6 percent; and 26.5 percent (the only rate deviating from the overall trend observed).

In addition, respondents with formal selection policies more often reported that recent challenges were overruled. Whereas 33.2 percent of the librarians (and 36.7 percent of the administrators) with formal policies indicated that recent challenges were overruled, only 20.0 percent of the librarians (and 31.5 percent of the administrators) without policies so indicated.

These responses seem to suggest that though schools with orderly procedures for selecting--and reconsidering challenged--instructional materials don't escape censorship pressures, they are perhaps able to resolve them more equitably and with less detriment to the educational environment.

Enrollment Size--Responses indicated that there is a direct relationship between enrollment size and the number of recent challenges. With the exception of one small deviation (for which the N is very small--only 12 responses), the percentage of both administrators and librarians reporting recent challenges increases steadily with increasing enrollment. The average number of incidents and items challenged also increases. This is not very surprising. (Lee Burress also noted, in his report on the 1977 NCTE Survey, that the likelihood of censorship increased with the size of the school.)

Survey responses also indicated that the larger the enrollment, the more likely schools are to have formal written policies and procedures. (For example, whereas only 59.3 percent of the librarians in schools or districts with enrollments 0-299 indicated they have formal reconsideration procedures, 91.2 percent of those with enrollments 25,000 and up so indicated.) This, too, is as one would expect--larger administrative units generally resort to more formalized procedures.

There appears to be no correlation at all between enrollment size and recent changes in the rate of challenges to materials.

Size of Community--The relationships observed with respect to policies and procedures and enrollment size hold quite consistently for both administrators and librarians. But when the responses to key questions are broken down by the size of community the school population is drawn from, considerable differences emerge between the two groups of respondents. Whereas only 13.5 percent of the administrators from large cities reported recent challenges, for example, 37.5 percent of the

librarians from large cities so reported--as compared with a rate of 26.5 percent for all respondents in the survey. Likewise, fewer than a fifth (18.9 percent) of the rural administrators reported recent challenges, as compared with nearly a third (32.2) percent of the rural librarians.

Overall, the highest percentages of respondents reporting recent challenges were in schools serving suburban communities (28.3 percent) or small cities (population 50,000-500,000)--30.2 percent.

There were appreciable differences, too, in the rates at which subsets of respondents replied that recent challenges had resulted in changes in the educational environment (question 5). Setting respondents from large cities aside because the sample was too small to be reliable, the other groups of respondents answering YES to question 5 ranked, by percentages of responses, as follows:

Administrators		Librarians		All Respondents	
Suburban	39.1%	Rural	37.1%	Suburban	36.2%
Smaller city	33.3%	Village/small		Rural	33.4%
Rural	31.3%	town	36.6%	Smaller city	30.1%
Town	25.3%	Town	34.9%	Town	29.4%
Village/Small		Suburban	31.8%	Village/small	
town	23.0%	Smaller city	25.0%	town	27.4%

Finally, the highest percentage (39.0 percent) of respondents reporting that the recent rate of challenges is higher than the previous two-year period was among librarians serving suburban communities.

Mail/Phone Survey of State-Adoption Administrators

As a supplement to the nationwide survey on the local level, a two-stage mail/phone survey was conducted of administrators responsible for overseeing the evaluation and adoption of instructional materials for the public schools in the 22 states with statewide adoption procedures.

Survey Design and Response

In June 1980, questionnaires were mailed to the appropriate individuals in each of the 22 adoption states. These questionnaires were based on the instruments used for local administrators, with questions modified as appropriate to the state-level situation. All but one of the 22 states eventually returned a completed questionnaire. (Only Arizona failed to complete the instrument, because the textbook officer there was very new to the post and did not yet feel qualified to respond.) Respondents were also asked to send copies of state regulations and/or guidelines pertaining to the selecton of book and instructional materials. Nineteen respondents did so; two respondents indicated that such documents were unavailable.

After receipt of the completed questionnaires and the state regulations and guidelines, follow-up phone interviews were conducted (between early August and late October, 1980) with all but one of the respondents. The purpose of the phone interviews was to verify and clarify questionnaire responses, and to gather additional information with respect to specific state regulations, experience with challenges, etc.

On the whole, respondents were very cooperative, often disarmingly candid, and demonstrated a high level of interest in the study, though they frequently asked not to be directly quoted.

Adoption Process

Much information was culled on the adoption process, which varies enormously from state to state. The very term "adoption" means quite different things in different states. In Arizona, for example, the state adoption list is only a recommended list. Except that books on the list are available at a discounted rate, there are not constraints at all on the choice or purchase of books by the local school districts.

Kentucky state law, on the other hand, requires (as a standard of accreditation) that, regardless of funding, "no textbooks shall be used in any public school in Kentucky as a basal textbook unless it has been approved and listed on the State Multiple List of Textbooks by the State Textbook Commission."

States also differ widely int he number of titles included in thier adoption lists. Some states, like Nevada and Idaho, have almost unlimited lists (omitting only those materials judged to be of grossly inferior quality with respect to content, presentation, manufacture, etc.) Others, like Texas and Mississippi, limit the number of adopted books in any category (subject and grade level) to a maximum of five titles. And many states fall somewhere between the two extremes.

Evaluation procedures, too, are highly variable. In one state, the members of the state textbook commission themselves evaluate the materials under consideration, while in other states the responsibility for evaluation is relegated to numerous subcommittees. In Indiana, distinguished for having by far the most elaborate evaluation and adoption procedures (devised in an effort to end the graft that influenced the process in earlier years), each of the seven textbook commissioners appoints up to 100 evaluation committees.

The number of members on the various state textbook committees, their mode of appointment (whether by the Governor, the State Superintendent, or the State Board), and the ratio of professional educators, lay citizens, etc., also differ markedly from state to state.

The issue of lay participation is particularly controversial. Several respondents were quite outspoken in stressing the professionalism of their textbook committees. When asked about "parent participation," they simply replied that many of the educators on the state committees are parents. They also maintain that the appropriate place for lay involvement in the selection of materials at the local level. But more than one state has recently yielded to pressure from the community to include lay citizens on the state adoption committees.

Challenges

The survey also generated valuable data on the current pressures on instructional materials selection. As might be expected, respondents indicated that the challenges to selection at the state level are generally more organized than those at the local level and far more frequently reveal the influence of national pressure groups, particularly those in the New Right.

With regard to the aspects most often challenged, a respondent from one of the larger adoption states noted that most of the recent challenges relate to "conservative" issues (creationism, right to life, etc.) whereas a few years ago the majority of challengers pressed for bias-free materials. Since many publishers have already responded to that demand, the more conservative challengers now predominate. The same respondent noted that the recent rate of challenges is lower than the preceding rate and attributed the decrease to the availability of bias-free materials from publishers.

Comparison with Local-Level Challenges

Not only were the state-level challenges more often initiated by groups than the local-level challenges, there were other differences as well. Whereas 95 percent of the local challenges sought to limit the information and viewpoints in the materials used in the schools, the majority of state-level challenges reported on sought to expand the materials (see comments on question 24 on the state survey). This difference may reflect a greater sophistication on the part of state-level pressure groups, perhaps more aware than local individuals of First Amendment distinctions.

The responses to question 25 on the local-level questionnaire and question 16 on the state-level instrument also suggest that different aspects tended to be challenged as objectionable (see the comments on survey responses below).

Nationwide Pressure Groups

In 10 out of 14 of the recent challenges cited, respondents indicated (question 23) that the challengers had referred to arguments or viewpoints developed by individuals or groups from outside the state. About half of all state-level respondents noted the probable influence of the Gablers. Moreover, all the respondents who indicated that the recent rate of challenges is higher than the rate in the preceding two-year period attributed the increase to the activity of the Gablers' Educational Research Analysts and other conservative, "New Right" groups.

A few respondents said that they received mailings directly from the Gablers in Texas, asking for information on their adoption cycles and schedule of hearings. Of particular interest is the marked difference, from one state to another, in the response to such outside inquiries. One textbook officer clearly distinguished between in-state and out-of-state pressure groups, and flatly refused to provide information to outside groups, though he would make it available to any group or resident within the state. An education department spokesman for another state, though viewing outside queries askance, admitted that he had reluctantly sent information directly to the Gablers' Educational Research Analysts. When asked why he had not withheld the information, he replied: "They could easily get it through a local affiliate anyway, so there didn't seem to be any point in not sending it."

There were also marked differences, from state to state, in the frequency and intensity of challenges. While a spokesman from one of the southern adoption states, for example, noted that they had not had any recent problems at all, a colleague in an adjacent state reported major challenges. One respondent wrote a letter to AAP (see Appendix A) expressing his deep concern about the censorship pressures on public education and enclosed with his questionnaire a number of pertinent documents and articles.

A few of the state-level respondents who reported no challenges attributed their freedom from such problems to the effectiveness of their policies and procedures, but several implied that it was at least partly due to luck and that it was only a matter of time before they too would come under fire from one pressure group or another.

* * *

It is of course difficult within the limited scope of this overview to delineate a fully rounded picture or to draw detailed conclusions. A few salient aspects should be emphasized, however. Though the rate of challenges reported at the local level may appear low to some observers, the responses on questions related to the nature and resolution of challenges seem to justify the concern, voiced by many observers, that basic constitutional rights maybe in jeopardy. Moreover, the comments of state-level respondents leave no doubt that the pressures on book and materials selection are increasingly organized and widespread; that many educators, deeply concerned about this phenomenon, feel themselves to be on the defensive; and that they would welcome recommendations on how to deal constructively with this complex challenge to a fundamental aspect of the educational process.

PART I

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND LIBRARIANS

Unless otherwise indicated, the survey questions were identical for administrators and librarians, and the response rates given are for all respondents. Appropriate headings indicate where questions and/or response rates differed for the two groups. Occasionally, significant differences between response rates of the various groups are noted in the comments.

Because of the length and complexity of the questionnaire, most respondents did not answer all items. The N therefore varies considerably from question to question.

A. Background Information

1. How long have you been in your present administrative post?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,891)
Less than 2 years	13.7%
2-5 years	25.9%
5-15 years	47.4%
More than 15 years	13.0%

The responses in both groups approximate a normal curve of distribution, with a peak at 5-15 years. Nearly half (47.4 percent) of all respondents were in this category.

The administrators' curve, however, was skewed more toward the shorter periods than was the librarians' (42.4 percent of the administrators responded that they were at their present post 5 years or less, as opposed to 33.3 percent of the librarians).

Regional Breakdown. There were considerable differences in the response rates on many of the items in this question among respondents from different parts of the country and from adoption versus open states. Fuller discussion of the differences is not possible within the scope of this report, however.

Administrators

2. To your knowledge, have there been any challenges to instructional or library materials in your school(s) DURING THE PERIOD SINCE SEPTEMBER 1, 1978?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,317)
Yes	19.2%
No	80.8%

Librarians

2. To your knowledge, have there been any challenges to library materials in your school(s) DURING THE PERIOD SINCE SEPTEMBER 1, 1978?

Responses	Percentages (N=580)
Yes	29.5%
No	70.5%

Of the total of 1,897 respondents to this item, 424 (22.4 percent) answered YES. The positive response rate was lowest among administrators (19.2 percent), highest among library-supervisors (32.8 percent).

Regional Breakdown. Percentages of respondents reporting recent challenges were fairly uniform from region to region and by adoption category. Only one group of respondents deviated more than two percentage points from the overall national average--that is, librarians from the West, 34.8 percent of whom reported recent challenges, as compared to the 29.5 percent rate for all librarians responding.

Administrators

In the period since September 1, 1978, have there been any challenges to the way instructional or library materials are selected in your school(s)?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,297)
Yes	6.9%
No	93.1%

Librarians

In the period since September 1, 1978, have there been any challenges to the way library materials are selected in your school(s)?

Responses	Percentages (N=566)
Yes	4.6%
No	95.4%

Only 115 respondents (6.2 percent) in all reported challenges to the selection process since September 1, 1978.

IF YOU ANSWERED NO TO BOTH PARTS OF QUESTION 2, please skip to question 6.

3. In the period since September 1, 1978, how many incidents of challenges have there been?

N=408

Some respondents, apparently confused by the wording, gave higher numbers here than in question 4. While the data are therefore not reliable in absolute terms, they were useful for ranking purposes.

The ranking of respondent groups, by mean number of incidents each group reported (from highest to lowest), was as follows:

(1) superintendents
(2) library supervisors
(3) principals
(4) building librarians

It is not surprising that the administrators ranked higher in mean number of incidents than the librarians, since they were reporting on challenges to classroom as well as library materials.

Administrators

4. How many separate materials or items have been challenged in the period since September 1, 1978? (If you do not know the exact number, please give an approximate figure.)

N=231

Librarians

4. How many separate library items have been challenged in the period since September 1, 1978? (If you do not know the exact number, please give an approximate figure.)

N=163

As with question 3, the data from question 4 have been used only for ranking purposes. Overall, the librarians reported a higher mean number of items challenged than did the administrators. The highest figures were at the district level in both groups--not surprisingly, since those respondents generally oversee larger populations.

How does this rate compare with the rate of challenges in the two-year period preceding September 1, 1978?

Responses	Percentages (N=494)
Lower	9.1%
About the same	50.6%
Higher	26.5%
Not certain	13.8%

Librarians' and administrators' responses were very similar. Frequency of responses, overall, are indicated above. While about half (50.6 percent) of the respondents who answered this question indicated that the recent rate of challenges is about the same as the rate in the preceding two-year period, over a fourth (26.5 percent) indicated that it is higher.

Regional Breakdown. There were a number of regional differences in the response rates on this question. The largest percentage of respondents answering "higher" occurred among administrators from the Midwest, 30.4 percent of whom so responded, as contrasted with the smallest figure (16.2 percent) among administrators from the West. On the other hand, 31.4 percent of the librarians from the West responded "lower."

Exactly 60.0 percent of the administrators from the Northeast responded "about the same," while only 43.0 percent of the librarians and administrators from the Midwest so responded.

Differences also emerged when the responses were broken down by adoption category. Respondents from the open states answered "higher" more often than did those from the adoption states.

The figures for administrators and librarians were 31.4 and 28.4 percent, respectively, for the open states as compared with 18.5 and 22.9 percent for the adoption states.

Administrators

5. Has any of the challenges since September 1, 1978, resulted in changes in the materials used or in the educational process or environment?

Responses	Percentages (N=317)
Yes	26.8%
No	68.5%
Case still pending	4.7%

Librarians

5. Has any of the challenges since September 1, 1978, resulted in changes in the holdings, organization, or operation of your library or media center(s)?

Responses	Percentages (N=193)
Yes	33.7%
No	64.8%
Case still pending	1.6%

Overall, 29.4 percent of the 510 respondents on this question answered YES. The highest positive response was from building-level librarians (37.8 percent). That the school library is most vulnerable to challenges is also attested by the administrators' responses to the second part of this question, where they indicated that, of all the educational aspects listed, library materials were most often affected by recent challenges.

Regional Breakdown. Among librarians, regional differences on this question were marked. Whereas only 20 percent of the librarians in the West reported that recent challenges had resulted in changes, 48.6 percent of the librarians in the South so reported.

Among administrators, regional differences were less striking. The highest rate of positive response was 31.3 percent, from the West. The lowest rate was 22.4 percent, for administrators from the Northeast.

Administrators

IF YES, please indicate which of the following has been affected (Check all that apply):

Responses (ranked by percentages)	Percentages (N=235*)
Library materials	32.7
Supplementary classroom materials	17.9
Textbooks used in the classroom	11.5
Materials selection procedure	11.1
Materials selection policy	8.1
Curriculum content	6.8
Teaching methodology	4.7
Personnel (firing, resignation, or reassignment)	3.0
Extracurricular activities	0.4
Other(s)	3.8

Librarians

IF YES, please indicate which of the following has been affected (Check all that apply):

Responses (ranked by percentages)	Percentages (N=112*)
Holdings	35.7
Access to certain items	29.5
Arrangement of holdings	17.8
Selection policy	10.7
Cataloging or identification of holdings	4.5
Personnel (firing, resignation, or reassignment)	0.9
Other(s)	0.9

Since respondents had the option of checking more than one answer, the percentages given above are based on the total number of responses, not on the number of respondents.

Administrators reported that library materials were affected almost twice as often as supplementary classroom materials, and almost three times as often as textbooks used in the classroom.

Five principals and two superintendents reported personnel changes as a result of challenges in the period since September 1, 1978. (Compare question 47 below.)

Only one library-supervisor here reported personnel changes as a result of recent challenges. However, the responses to question 47 indicate a higher figure.

6. By which procedure(s) are classroom instructional materials selected in the school(s) you serve?

Responses	Basal Textbooks (N=1,818)	Supplementary Classroom Materials (N=1,650)
Local district autonomy	50.4%	72.7%
From state-approved list	28.3%	5.6%
From county-approved list	4.0%	2.4%
From city-approved list	1.5%	1.5%
Procedures differ for elementary and secondary	2.6%	4.9%
Other	2.4%	4.2%
[More than one response checked]	10.8%	8.7%

Administrators

7. Does the school (district) you administer have a formal written policy governing the selection of instructional materials?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,261)
Yes	52.8%
No	47.2%

Librarians

IF CLASSROOM INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS ARE SELECTED FROM APPROVED OR ADOPTION LISTS, please interpret all questions on materials selection as referring to library materials not on approved or adoption lists.

7. Does the school (district) you serve have a formal written policy governing the selection of library materials?

Responses	Percentages (N=564)
Yes	74.3%
No	25.7%

Nearly three-fourths (74.3 percent) of the librarians reported they had a formal selection policy, as opposed to just over half (52.8 percent) of the administrators. Taking the two groups together, 59.4 percent of all respondents on this question (N=1,825) indicated they had a formal selection policy.

Regional Breakdown. Some marked regional differences emerged on this question. The highest positive response rates were from the West; the lowest, from the South. The difference was most dramatic among administrators. Just under 70.0 percent of those in the West responded YES, as compared with 45.4 percent of those in the South. For librarians, the positive response rate in the West was 81.8 percent; in the South, 70.5 percent.

Administrators

8. Does the school (district) you administer have formal written procedures for the reconsideration of instructional materials that have been challenged?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,295)
Yes	49.1%
No	50.9%

Librarians

8. Does the school (district) you serve have formal written procedures for the reconsideration of library materials that have been challenged?

Responses	Percentages (N=570)
Yes	76.8%
No	23.2%

Responses to this question closely mirror those to the preceding question, suggesting that schools with a formal selection policy have formal reconsideration procedures as well. Overall, 57.6 percent of the 1,865 respondents indicated they had formal reconsideration procedures.

Regional Breakdown. Regional differences on this question paralleled those on question 7. Just over 60 percent of the administrators in the West responded YES, as compared with 40.9 percent of those in the South. The positive response for administrators from the Northeast (45.8 percent) was also several points lower than the national average.

Positive response rates for the open versus adoption states were 51.4 and 44.9 percent, respectively.

IF YES, which statement best describes your reconsideration procedures?

Administrators

Responses	Percentages (N=620)
Part of overall selection policy statement	53.9%
Separate from selection policy statement	46.1%

Librarians

Responses	Percentages (N=431)
Part of library selection policy statement	70.8%
Separate from selection policy statement	29.2%

Again, there are appreciable differences between administrators' and librarians' responses, with librarians reporting far more often (70.8 percent) than administrators (53.9 percent) that their reconsideration procedures are part of their selection policy statement.

Administrators

9. What grades are under your administration?

Librarians

9. What grades do you serve?

Responses	Percentages		
	Administrators (N=1,298)	Librarians (N=561)	All Respondents) (N=1,859)
K-6	18.6%	12.1%	16.2%
K-8	8.6%	7.1%	8.2%
K-12	47.8%	37.8%	44.8%
7-9	2.5%	3.9%	3.8%
7-12	3.2%	10.2%	5.3%
9-12	8.1%	16.6%	10.6%
Other	11.8%	12.3%	11.9%

The largest group of respondents (47.8 percent of the administrators, 37.8 percent of the librarians, and 44.8 percent overall) served grades K-12.

Grades K-8 accounted for 26.6 percent of the administrators, 19.2 percent of the librarians, and 24.4 percent overall.

Intermediate and upper grades 7-12 together accounted for 13.8 percent of the administrators, 30.7 percent of the librarians, and 18.9 percent of all the respondents.

Approximately 12 percent of the respondents in both groups indicated that they served grade spans other than those listed on the questionnaire.

Thus, the librarians' group was skewed more to the upper grades than was the administrators' group.

Administrators	Librarians
10. How many students are under your administration?	10. How many students are enrolled in the schools(s) you serve?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,884)
0-299	10.9%
300-599	27.0%
600-999	18.7%
1,000-2,999	23.1%
3,000-4,999	7.0%
5,000-9,999	6.6%
10,000-24,999	3.5%
25,000 and up	3.2%

[Note: The original sample omitted schools with enrollments under 100.]

The percentages listed above are for all groups combined. Schools and districts with enrollments less than 3,000 accounted for 79.7 percent of all respondents, with the largest single group in the 300-599 bracket.

There were some differences in enrollment distribution between the subgroups, however. Nearly half (42.4 percent) of the administrators were in the 0-599 categories, as opposed to just over a fourth (26.8 percent) of the librarians; while 20.4 percent of the librarians were in the 5,000-25,000 and up categories, as opposed to only 10.3 percent of the administrators.

Also, building-level respondents were most numerous in the 300-599 category (46.1 percent), while the largest single group of district-level respondents (30.0 percent) was in the 1,000-2,999 category.

11. What sort of community is your school population drawn from? (Check all that apply.)

Responses (ranked by percentages)	Percentages (N=2368*)
Rural	27.6%
Village or small town (up to 5,000 pop.)	22.9%
Town (pop. 5,000-49,999)	22.6%
Suburban	14.8%
Smaller city (pop. 50,000-500,000)	8.6%
Large city (pop. over 500,000)	3.5%

---

*Respondents had the option of checking more than one response. (About one fourth of the respondents did so.) Percentages listed above are based on the total number of responses, not the number of respondents.

Schools serving rural areas, villages, and/or small townships (pop. under 50,000) were most heavily represented, with a combined frequency of 73.1 percent, as opposed to a total frequency of 12.1 percent for schools serving urban communities (pop. over 50,000), and 14.8 percent for those serving suburban communities. The rural/small town figure was undoubtedly magnified by overlapping multiple responses, more likely to occur in these categories than in the urban-suburban categories.

It is perhaps also worth noting differences between building- and district-level responses to this question. Whereas 20.8 percent of the building-level responses indicated urban communities (pop. 50,000 and over), only 7.4 percent of the district-level responses did so. Rural/small town communities, however, were more heavily represented by district-level respondents (55.6 percent of their total responses were in these categories) than by building-level respondents (only 41.3 percent of their total responses fell into these groups).

Before any conclusions can be drawn from this distribution, it should be compared with the national population.

---

12. Please indicate your rough estimate of the economic make-up of your school population (please be sure total equals 100%):

Responses	Mean Percentages	
	Administrators (N=1,270)	Librarians (N=501)
Poverty level	11.0%	9.0%
Low	19.4%	19.2%
Lower-middle	37.7%	39.2%
Upper-middle	26.0%	28.1%
High	6.9%	7.9%
Total	101.0%	103.4%

Totals in excess of 100% may be due partly to rounding error, partly to respondents' error in giving percentages totaling more than 100%.

Responses in both groups fall into a normal distribution and indicate that the survey sample is representative of the total population with respect to economic makeup.

13. What is the zip code of your office?

Zip codes were used to identify the respondents' state and to group them by geographic region and adoption category. Table II shows the sample breakdown compared to the national population. As the table indicates, the sample quite closely reflects the national distribution, except for the following: a somewhat higher percentage of both administrators and librarians from the Midwest; a somewhat lower percentage of administrators from the South and the West; and a slightly higher percentage of administrators from the "open," as opposed to the "adoption," states.

Table II

Survey Sample Compared to National Population by Geographic Region and Adoption Category

	Administrators		Librarians		All Respondents		Percentage in National Population
Subgroups	N	%	N	%	N	%	%
Geographic Region							
Northeast	292	22.2%	135	23.4%	427	22.6%	24.6%
South	265	20.2%	113	23.1%	378	20.0%	24.3%
Midwest	604	46.0%	241	41.8%	845	44.7%	35.4%
West	153	11.6%	88	15.3%	241	12.7%	15.7%
Total	1314	100.0%	577	100.0%	1891	100.0%	100.0%
Adoption Category							
Adoption States	463	35.2%	231	40.0%	694	36.7%	42.0%
Open States	851	64.8%	346	60.0%	1197	63.3%	58.0%
Total	1314	100.0%	577	100.0%	1891	100.0%	100.0%

IF YOU HAVE NO FORMAL WRITTEN POLICIES GOVERNING MATERIALS SELECTION OR RECONSIDERATION, please skip to question 17-A (18-L).

B. Policies and Procedures

14. At what level was your materials selection policy developed and approved? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Percentages Developed (N=1,503*)	Percentages Approved (N=1,273*)
At the state level	6.9%	6.3%
At the county level	9.3%	9.7%
At the city level	3.8%	3.6%
At the district level	55.3%	64.6%
At the building Level	13.1%	8.9%
At the departmental level	10.1%	6.0%
Other(s)	1.5%	0.9%

Some respondents checked more than one answer in each column. Percentages are therefore calculated on the total number of responses (not respondents). Over half (55.6 percent) of the responses indicated that selection policies were developed at the district level, while 64.6 percent indicated they were approved at the district level. Remaining responses were distributed fairly evenly over the other categories.

---

15. What controversial issues are referred to in your selection policy? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Percentages (N=2,635*)
None	22.5%
Racism	13.4%
Religion	13.3%
Sexism	12.5%
Minority group representation	12.1%
Sex and sexuality	11.9%
Scientific theories	5.2%
Ageism	3.3%
Other(s)	5.8%

Administrators and librarians responded similarly. Percentages (based on total number of responses) for both groups combined are given above.

Librarians

16. Please check if your selection policy statement reaffirms the following (or any other pertinent professional statement):

Responses	Percentages (N=352)
The American Library Association's "Library Bill of Rights" (only)	62.2%
The ALA-AAP "Freedom to Read" Statement (only)	3.1%
Other(s)	5.4%
[More than one response checked]	29.3%

Out of the 419 librarians who indicated (question 7, above) that they have a formal selection policy, 352 (84 percent) responded that their policy statement reaffirms the ALA "Library Bill of Rights," the ALA-AAP "Freedom-to-Read Statement," and/or some other pertinent professional statement.

Nearly two-thirds (62.2 percent) of the respondents with a formal selection policy indicated that they referred only to the ALA statement, while just under one-third (29.3 percent) indicated they referred to more than one of the above.

Administrators

16. Does your school (district) inform parents and other members of the community about the policies and procedures for selecting and reconsidering instructional materials?

Responses	Percentages (N=774)
Yes	61.5%
No	37.5%

IF YES, how?

Librarians

17. Do you inform parents and other members of the community about your selection policy and reconsideration procedures?

Responses	Percentages (N=422)
Yes	42.7%
No	57.3%

IF YES, how?

Overall, 54.8 percent of the 1,196 respondents indicated they do inform the community about selection policies and procedures, but note the sizable difference between administrators' and librarians' responses (61.5 and 42.7 percent, respectively).

A positive response to this question was taken as one indicator of good public relations programs.

IF AVAILABLE, PLEASE ENCLOSE A COPY OF YOUR MATERIALS SELECTION POLICY AND RECONSIDERATION PROCEDURES.

Administrators

C. Evaluation and Selection of Textbooks and Instructional Materials

17. Does the school (district) you administer have its own instructional materials selection committee?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,276)
Yes	55.7%
No	44.3%

IF YES, please skip to question 18.

The positive response to this question was slightly higher among principals (58.1 percent) than among superintendents (53.9 percent).

Administrators

IF NO, which of the following individuals is involved at each stage of selecting instructional materials for use in your schools(s)?

Evaluate and Recommend Materials (N=2,791*)		Final Choice and Approval (N=1,486*)	
Responses	Percentages	Responses	Percentages
Teachers	21.5%	Principals	20.6%
Principals	16.8%	Superintendents	20.3%
Librarians	15.6%	School Board	16.3%
Department heads	10.2%	Teachers	11.8%
Curriculum Specialists	7.0%	Librarians	9.4%
Superintendent	6.7%	Department heads	6.4%
Assistant principals	5.3%	Assistant superintendents	5.8%
Guidance specialists	5.1%	Curriculum specialists	3.8%
Assistant superintendents	4.2%	Assistant principals	2.6%
Parents	2.8%	Guidance specialists	1.5%
Students	2.6%	Parents	0.7%
School board	1.4%	Students	0.5%
Other	0.8%	Other	0.3%

The responses given above are for all administrators and are ranked by percentages.

Principals' and superintendents' groups responded very similarly, on all but two items: (1) The superintendents' group more often cited superintendents as involved in evaluation (8.2 percent) and approval (22.5 percent) than did principals (4.5 and 16.9 percent, respectively). (2) Guidance specialists were cited as involved in evaluation somewhat more often by superintendents (6.2 percent) than by principals (3.5 percent).

Librarians

C. Evaluation and Selection of Library Materials

18. Who suggests materials for your library or media center(s)? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Percentages (N=3,405*)
Teachers	16.8%
Librarians	16.4%
Students	15.0%
Principals	11.0%
Guidance specialists	9.9%
Curriculum specialists	8.7%
Parents	6.3%
Assistant principals	6.2%
Superintendents	3.9%
Assistant superintendents	2.8%
School board members	2.1%
Other(s)	1.0%

---

*Librarians and library-supervisors responded similarly on this item (overall percentages are given above).

Administrators

18. How many of the following individuals are (were) represented on your current (or most recent) materials selection committee? (Please also give total number of committee members.)

Responses (ranked from most to least numerous)	Average Number of Members per Committee
Teacher(s)	4.6
School board member(s)	3.0 (P=3.6; S=2.7)
Parent(s)	3.0
Department head(s)	2.7
Teachers' organization representative(s)	2.7
Student(s)	2.2
Principal(s)	1.9
Civic leader(s)	1.9
Assistant principal(s)	1.8
Curriculum specialist(s)	1.6
Librarian(s) or media specialist(s)	1.6
Instructional specialist(s)	1.4
Director of media center	1.2
Director of curriculum	1.1
Superintendent	1.0
Assistant superintendent	1.0
Others	2.0 (P=1.2, S=2.4)

Responses of principals (P) and superintendents (S) were closely comparable (averages within 0.1 or 0.2), except with respect to "school board members" and "others." The disparate averages are given above.

A question should be posed about the number of principals reported by principals to be selection committee members (average 1.8). As worded, question 18 should have been interpreted by principals as referring to building-level committees. If that were the case, would more than one principal be involved?

Administrators

19. What is the function of your local materials selection committee?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,046)
To review and recommend materials	32.1%
To review and select materials, subject to approval	48.3%
To review, select, and adopt materials, without further approval	10.2%
Other	2.0%
[More than one response checked]	7.4%

Responses of principals' and superintendents' groups were closely comparable on all items (largest spread was under 3.0 percentage points). Percentages given above are for both groups combined. The largest number--nearly half (48.3 percent) of all respondents--indicated that their selection committee's function is "to review and select materials, subject to approval," while 32.1 percent reported it as only "to review and recommend."

Administrators

20. If your local selection committee does not have the authority to make the final determination regarding materials, who gives final approval? (Check all that apply.)

Librarians

19. If you do not make the final determination regarding the purchase of library or media center materials, who gives final approval?

Responses	Percentages		
	Administrators (N=1,289*)	Building-Librarians (N=46*)	Library-Supervisors (N=153*)
Local school board	50.4%	6.5%	16.3%
District superintendent	25.7%	23.9%	34.0%
School principal(s)	15.4%	39.1%	33.3%
Teacher(s)	5.3%	2.2%	0.7%
Other(s)	3.2%	28.3%	15.7%

Some respondents checked more than one item. Percentages are therefore based on the total number of responses. Since there were sizable differences in the way administrators, librarians, and library-supervisors responded, the results for the three groups are given separately above.

Librarians

20. Have you ever met with representatives of publishing houses or nonprint media companies to discuss their materials?

Responses	Percentages (N=575)
Yes	83.1%
No	16.9%

The high positive response rate (83.1 percent) here may be due to the broad wording of the question, which can be taken to include contact at professional conferences, etc., in addition to actual visits by publishers' representatives to the school(s).

Administrators

21. Do publishers' representatives have an opportunity to explain their materials to the committee or individuals responsible for evaluation and selection?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,261)
Yes	92.4%
No	7.6%

IF YES, when? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Percentages (N=1,317*)
At reviewing stage	81.0%
After selection	15.1%
After challenges	3.9%

(NOTE: Percentages for the second part of the question are based on total number of responses, not respondents).

The majority of respondents indicated that publishers' representatives have an opportunity, at the reviewing stage, to explain materials to those responsible for evaluation and selection.

Administrators

22. In the school (district) you administer are there provisions for special interest groups to make their views known to the persons responsible for evaluating or selecting materials?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,252)
Yes	57.8%
No	42.2%

Librarians

21. Have you ever met with representatives of special interest groups to discuss controversial aspects of the library's holdings?

Responses	Percentages (N=574)
Yes	14.5%
No	85.5%

IF YES, when?

Responses	Percentages		
	Building-Librarians (N=14)	Library-Supervisors (N=69)	Total (N=83)
Routinely, independent of any challenges	50.0%	60.9%	59.0%
After materials were challenged	50.0%	39.1%	41.0%

As the above figures show, there was a marked difference between the librarians' and administrators' responses on this item. Differences were also evident within the librarians' group: only 7.6 percent of the building-level librarians, as compared with 17.3 percent of the library-supervisors, responded YES to this question.

Of the 83 librarians who responded YES to the first part of this question, 41.0 percent indicated that they met with special-interest groups only after materials were challenged. Again, the breakdown of responses by subgroups suggested a greater public relations effort on the district level than on the building level. A higher percentage of library-supervisors (60.9 percent) than building-level librarians (50.0 percent) indicated that they had such meetings "routinely, independent of any challenges."

Librarians

22. On which of the following do you rely most heavily in evaluating and selecting library materials? (Circle number from 1 for most important to 6 for least important.)

Responses (ranked from most to least important)	N*	Mean Figures
Professional reviews	564	1.89
Your own examination of the material	548	1.92
Teachers	560	2.19
Educational research and/or classroom experience	527	2.80
Other(s)	65	3.28
Publishers' representatives and promotional materials	528	4.43

Responses varied considerably, with the entire ranking scale of 1 to 6 being covered for each of the six answers listed on the questionnaire. (For example, though most respondents indicated that "publishers' representatives and materials" were less important to them than other evaluation factors, a total of 36 respondents checked 1 or 2 on the scale for this item.)

Librarians

23. If you were considering the purchase of potentially controversial library material you judged to have real educational or literary value, which of the following would you be most likely to do?

Responses	Percentages (N=544)
Decide not to purchase in spite of educational value	6.4%
Decide to purchase in spite of controversial aspects	17.3%
Consult with teachers and administrative staff and be guided by their judgment	73.7%
Other	2.6%

Building-level librarians and library-supervisors responded similarly (within 3 percentage points). The majority (73.7 percent overall) indicated that they would "consult with teachers and administrative staff and be guided by their judgment," while 17.3 percent indicated that they would "decide to purchase in spite of controversial aspects." Only 6.4 percent of the respondents checked "decide not to purchase in spite of educational value." The remaining 2.6 percent checked "other."

Administrators

23. When controversial materials are selected, are any provisions made to explain them to parents and other members of the community?

Responses	Percentages (N=1,155)
Yes	59.8%
No	40.2%

IF YES, when?

Responses	Percentages (N=680)
Before materials are challenged (only)	54.1%
After materials are challenged (only)	35.0%
[Both responses checked]	10.9%

IF YES, what sorts of provisions are made? (Check all that apply.)

Responses (ranked by percentages)	Percentages (N=1,477*)
Discussion meetings with parents	39.0%
Written rationales	17.0%
Local newspaper items	13.9%
School newspaper items	11.2%
P.T.A. newsletter	9.3%
Mini-lessons for parents	5.3%
Other	4.2%

Overall, 59.8 percent of the 1,155 respondents answered YES to the first part of question 23, indicating that their school or district does make provisions to explain controversial materials to the community. The figure was somewhat higher for principals (63.2 percent), however, than for superintendents (57.3 percent).

Of the 680 respondents who answered the question "IF YES, when," 54.1 percent checked only "before challenges"; 35.0 percent checked only "after challenges"; and 10.9 percent checked both.

On the question of what sorts of provisions are made, the responses of principals' and superintendents' groups were closely comparable (within 3 percentage points) on all items. The percentages given above are for both groups combined. (Some respondents checked more than one item; percentages are therefore based on the total number of responses, rather than on the number of respondents.)

Librarians

24. What provisions are made in the school(s) you serve to inform the local community (students, teachers, parents, local residents, etc.) about the school library's educational program?

Responses	Percentages		
	Building-Librarians (N=170)	Library-Supervisors (N=405)	All Librarians (N=575)
No special provisions	28.8%	21.7%	23.8%
School newspaper items	7.6%	3.7%	4.9%
Local newspaper items	4.1%	3.5%	3.7%
Hold library open house periodically	6.5%	3.7%	4.5%
Hold informal discussions with parents	2.4%	0.7%	1.2%
Discussions at P.T.A. meetings	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%
Other	4.1%	2.0%	2.6%
[More than one response checked]	45.9%	64.4%	59.0%

As the response rates above show, the public relations activities listed here appear, overall, to be more frequent on the district level. While 28.8 percent of the building-level librarians reported "no special provisions" for informing the local community, only 21.7 percent of the library-supervisors so responded. On the other hand, 64.4 percent of the library-supervisors reported more than one kind of provision, while only 45.9 percent of the building-level librarians so indicated.

IF THERE HAVE BEEN NO CHALLENGES TO INSTRUCTIONAL OR LIBRARY MATERIALS IN YOUR SCHOOL (DISTRICT) SINCE SEPTEMBER 1, 1978, please skip to question 52.

Administrators	Librarians
D. Challenges to Materials Selected for School Libraries and Classrooms	D. Challenges to School Library Materials
24. In the period since September 1, 1978, what kinds (categories) of instructional or library items have been challenged in your school(s)? (Check all that apply)	25. In the period since September 1, 1978, what kinds (categories) of library materials have been challenged in your school(s)? (Check all that apply.)

Responses (ranked by percentages within each group of respondents)

Administrators (N=482*)		Librarians (N=355*)		All Respondents (N=837*)	
Fiction, contemporary	36.0	Fiction, contemporary	38.1	Fiction, contemporary	36.8
Textbooks	14.3	Nonfiction trade books	13.2	Textbooks	11.5
Fiction, classics	8.7	Children's picture books	10.1	Nonfiction trade books	8.6
Magazines	5.8	Textbooks	7.6	Children's picture books	7.5
16 mm. educational films	5.8	Magazines	6.8	Fiction, classics	7.2
Children's picture books	5.6	Fiction, classics	5.1	Magazines	6.2
Nonfiction trade books	5.2	16 mm. educational films	5.1	16 mm. educational films	5.5
Entire course or curriculum	4.1	Entire course or curriculum	2.5	Entire course or curriculum	2.5
Reference books other than dictionaries	2.9	Poetry	2.5	Reference books other than dictionaries	2.4
Dramatic or theatrical material	2.5	Reference books other than dictionaries	1.7	Dramatic or theatrical material	2.1
Brochures, pamphlets, etc.	2.3	Dramatic or theatrical material	1.7	Poetry	1.8
Poetry	1.2	Dictionaries	0.8	Brochures, pamphlets, etc.	1.6
Newspapers	0.6	Brochures pamphlets, etc.	0.6	Dictionaries	0.6
Dictionaries	0.4			Newspapers	0.3

As might be expected, the frequency with which different kinds of materials were reported as challenged varied considerably from the administrators' to the librarians' group. (Administrators were asked to report on library as well as classroom materials, whereas librarians were asked to report only on library materials.) Both groups ranked contemporary fiction highest.

26. What were alleged to be the objectionable aspects of the challenged materials? (Check all that apply).

Responses (ranked by percentages)	Percentages (N=1,700*)
"Dirty words"	14.5%
Obscenity	11.6%
Explicit representation of sex	8.3%
Profanity	6.9%
Sexism	4.7%
Religious bias	4.0%
Violence	4.0%
Nudity	3.6%
The occult	3.6%
"Undermining of traditional family"	2.9%
Realism	2.8%
Homosexuality	2.6%
Explicit discussion of drugs and drug abuse	2.5%
Racism	2.0%
Darwinism, evolution	2.0%
Moral relativism or situation ethics	2.0%
Values clarification	2.0%
Minority representation	1.9%
Abortion	1.8%
"Secular humanism"	1.7%
Antitraditional/antiestablishment views	1.5%
Substandard English usage or dialect	1.3%
Negative or pessimistic views	1.3%
Atheistic or agnostic views	1.2%
Emphasis on psychology or feelings	1.2%
Scientific theories	1.0%
Invasion of personal privacy	0.8%
Death and dying	0.8%
Pagan studies	0.7%
Criticism of U.S. history	0.7%
Atrocities	0.6%
"Questionable" or "subversive" authors	0.6%
Ethnic studies	0.5%
Ageism	0.4%
Internationalism	0.2%
Other(s)	2.6%

The broad spread of aspects cited by respondents supports Lee Burress's contention (in his report on the 1977 NCTE Survey) that school censorship attempts are essentially capricious. It is interesting to note that the aspects most often reported as challenged on the local level are related to sex and obscenity, issues which have long incited would-be censors. (But compare the responses to question 16 on the state-level survey.)

As with the responses to question 24 (25-L), there were some differences between the two groups' responses to these questions, however. The ranking (by percentage of responses) of the ten most cited aspects was as follows:

As Reported by Administrators (N=976*)	%	As Reported by Librarians (N=724*)	%	As Reported by All Respondents (N=1,700*)	%
"Dirty words"	15.2%	"Dirty words"	14.4%	"Dirty words"	14.5%
Obscenity	12.8%	Explicit sex	11.0%	Obscenity	11.6%
Explicit sex	6.3%	Obscenity	9.9%	Explicit sex	8.3%
Sexism	6.1%	Profanity	8.0%	Profanity	6.9%
Profanity	6.0%	Violence	4.4%	Sexism	4.7%
Religious bias	4.2%	Nudity	4.1%	Religious bias	4.0%
Violence	3.7%	The occult	4.0%	Violence	4.0%
The occult	3.4%	Realism	3.9%	Nudity	3.6%
Nudity	3.2%	Religious bias	3.7%	The occult	3.6%
"Undermining of traditional family"	3.1%	Sexism	2.8%	"Undermining of traditional family"	2.9%

IF MORE THAN THREE SPECIFIC TITLES (OR ITEMS) HAVE BEEN CHALLENGED IN THE PERIOD SINCE SEPTEMBER 1, 1978, please respond, in questions 26-52 [L-27-53], on the three challenges which have had the greatest impact on your school(s) and might have relevance for other schools as well. (You will probably find it easiest to answer the questions, in order, for one case at a time, rather than for all cases at once.)

IF YOU WISH TO RESPOND ON MORE THAN THREE CHALLENGES, you may photocopy the balance of this questionnaire for additional responses.

26. Please identify the challenged items, and indicate what kind (category) of material each is (giving the appropriate letter from the list in question 24 [25-L].

Some respondents indicated, by marginal remarks on the questionnaire, that they misinterpreted this instruction. Thinking that it meant they were not to answer questions 26-52 unless they had had more than three challenges, they did not complete the balance of the questionnaire. Thus the number of challenges reported on is smaller than the number experienced by the sample population.

It is impossible, within the scope of this report, to list the challenged items reported by those respondents who did answer. As in earlier surveys by the NCTE and others, the range of items was very broad.

---

27. What was the grade level of the challenged material? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Percentages N*	%
K & lower elementary	96	16.7%
Upper elementary	137	23.8%
Junior high	159	27.6%
Senior high	184	31.9%
Total	576	100.0%

As reported by both main subgroups (all administrators and all librarians), the frequency of challenges increases steadily with increasing grade level. (The gradient, though still observable, is less smooth for the building- and district-level subgroups than for the total sample, however.) The censorship pressure on upper-grade materials may be even greater than indicated here, since the survey sample appears to be somewhat weighted toward the lower grades (see above, comments on question 9). These factors may help to explain why the rates of censorship pressures reported in this survey are lower than those reported in the 1977 NCTE survey.

---

*NOTE: Here and in all items through question 51, an asterisk is used to denote when N is the sum of responses, not respondents (many respondents answered on more than one case).

28. If you have a selection policy, was it followed in the selection of this material?

Responses	Percentages (N=422*)
Yes	79.9%
No	20.1%

Respondents indicated that in just under 80 percent of the incidents cited their selection policy was followed in the selection of the challenged material. There was a considerable spread between the responses of principals and librarians, however. Only 68.8 percent of the principals reported that their selection policy was followed, as compared with 87.5 percent of the building-level librarians.

29. Was the educational rationale for using this material made known to parents or other members of the school community before the material was challenged?

Responses	Percentages (N=472*)
Yes	21.4%
No	78.6%

Respondents indicated that in only about a fifth (21.4 percent) of the cases cited had the educational rationale for using the material been made known to the community before the challenge. Again, there was a sizable spread between responses of the subgroups in the sample. Nearly 30 percent of the principals reported such action, as compared to 11.1 percent of the building-level librarians. This disparity may relate at least partly to fundamental differences between classroom and library functions.

30. To which part(s) of the material did the challenger object?

Responses	Percentages (N= 501*)
Illustrations or images (only)	12.8%
Text or narration (only)	75.8%
Both illustrations and text	11.4%

Both administrators and librarians indicated that in the great majority of cases (75.8 percent overall) the challengers objected only to the textual part of the material; in only 12.8 percent, to the illustrations alone; and in 11.4 percent, to both text and illustrations.

---

31. Who initiated the challenge?

Responses	Percentages
Individual, representing him/herself	77.9%
Individual, representing a group	16.7%
Group	5.4%

Please specify (check all that apply):

Responses	Percentages (N=304*)
School board member(s)	6.4%
District-level administrator(s)	2.4%
Building-level administrator(s)	5.7%
Librarians(s)	3.5%
Teacher(s)	9.4%
Student(s)	2.4%
Parent(s)	52.3%
Clergy	4.7%
Community resident(s)	9.2%
P.T.A.	0.5%
Other local group(s)	2.8%
State group(s)	0.0%
National group(s)	0.2%
Other group(s) or individual(s)	0.5%

Administrators' and librarians' groups responded very similarly on the first part of this question. In the great majority (77.9 percent overall) of the 304 incidents reported on, respondents indicated that the challenge was initiated by an "individual representing him/herself."

Administrators and librarians responded somewhat differently in specifying challengers, however. Both groups reported that parents were the most frequent challengers. But the frequency of parent challenges reported by the two groups varied, as did the rate at which other individuals or groups were cited. The principal challengers reported by the two groups of respondents ranked as follows (see next page):

Challengers cited by Administrators (N=207*) (ranked by percentages)	%
Parent(s)	60.8%
Community resident(s)	9.7%
School board member(s)	7.7%
Teacher(s)	6.8%
Clergy	5.8%

Challengers cited by Librarians (N=216*) (ranked by percentages)	%
Parent(s)	44.0%
Teacher(s)	12.0%
Building-level administrator(s)	10.2%
Community resident(s)	8.8%
Librarian(s)	5.5%
School board member(s)	5.1%
District-level administrator(s)	4.2%

Note that librarians reported school personnel (teachers, administrators, and librarians) as initiating 31.9 percent of the challenges cited, whereas administrators reported school personnel as initiating only 9.7 percent of the challenges.

---

32. Did any of the local media report or editorialize on the incident?

Responses	Percentages (N=513*)
Yes	15.2%
No	84.8%

IF YES, what position was taken?

Responses	Percentages (N=89*)
Remained neutral on the issue	40.4%
Defended the use of the challenged materials	29.2%
Opposed the use of the challenged materials	7.9%
Positions varied	19.1%
Other(s)	3.4%

In the vast majority (84.8 percent) of the challenges cited by respondents, there was no media coverage at all. Administrators reported media coverage somewhat more frequently (17.6 percent) than librarians (12.4 percent).

Although only 78 respondents answered YES to the first part of the question, there were 89 responses to the second part--some respondents apparently checked more than one answer (percentages are therefore based on the total number of responses). In the majority of cases where the local media were involved, they either remained neutral (40.4 percent of the total) or defended the use of the challenged material (29.2 percent). Nearly a fifth (19.1 percent) of the responses indicated that the media positions varied.

Media opposition to the use of challenged materials was reported somewhat more frequently by administrators (10.5 percent) than by librarians (3.1 percent). This difference may relate to the "captive-audience" distinction between the classroom and the library.

---

33. Had the person(s) who initiated the challenge read or viewed the challenged material in its entirety?

Responses	Percentages (N=510*)
Yes	45.5%
No	31.8%
Not sure	22.7%

Figures reported above are for all respondents. Percentages within subgroups varied somewhat. For example, over a fourth (27.0 percent) of the librarians replied "Not sure," as compared with fewer than a fifth (19.0 percent) of the administrators.

---

34. Did the person(s) challenging the material refer to arguments or viewpoints developed by individuals or groups from outside the community?

Percentages (by group of respondents)

	P (N=91)	S (N=177)	Total A: (N=268)	B-L (N=33)	L-S (N=208)	Total L: (N=241)	Sum (A+L) (N=509)
Responses							
Yes	18.7%	24.9%	22.8%	3.0%	11.5%	10.4%	16.9%
No	68.1%	61.0%	63.4%	90.9%	72.6%	75.4%	69.0%
Not sure	13.2%	14.1%	13.8%	6.1%	15.9%	14.5%	14.1%

IF YES, please specify the group or individual, if known.

Overall, nearly a fifth (16.9 percent) of the 509 respondents on this question replied YES, 69.0 percent replied NO, and 14.1 percent indicated they were not sure. As the above breakdown shows, however, the various subgroups answered quite differently on this question. Positive response rates were considerably higher at the district level (superintendents, 24.9 percent; library-supervisors, 11.5 percent) than at the building level (principals, 18.7 percent; building-level librarians, 3.0 percent). Building-level librarians reported that in 90.9 percent of the incidents, the challengers did not refer to outside arguments or views.

Two interpretations of the differing responses are possible. Building-level personnel may be less aware of outside groups than district personnel. Or it may be that outside pressure groups and organized challenges are concentrated on the higher administrative levels, where they can achieve a broader impact. (The latter would be borne out by the state-level survey, which reveals considerable activity by outside groups such as the Gablers' "Educational Research Analysts.")

---

35. Which did the challenger(s) seek to do:

Responses	Percentages (N=452*)
Expand the information and viewpoints in the materials used and/or introduce new points of view	5.3%
Limit the information and viewpoints in the materials used	94.7%

From the perspective of concern over censorship, this is one of the most significant items in the survey. The vast majority of respondents in both groups indicated that challengers most often sought to censor, rather than to expand, materials used in the schools. Censorship pressures were indicated to be highest by building-level librarians, who reported that all of the challenges which they reported on for the period since September 1, 1978, sought to "limit the information and viewpoints in the materials used," while 93.4 percent of the administrators and 95.6 percent of the library-supervisors so responded.

36. How was the challenge dealt with?

Responses	Percentages (N=508*)
Informally	60.4%
Through formal procedures	39.6%

Figures given above are for all respondents. Sizable differences appeared in the subgroups' responses, however. Building-level respondents more often replied that challenges were dealt with "informally" (principals, 73.1 percent; building-librarians, 75.7 percent) than did district-level respondents (superintendents, 50.3 percent; library-supervisors, 60.4 percent).

37. Was the challenged material altered, restricted, or removed prior to a formal review?

Responses	Percentages (N=500*)
Yes	50.0%
No	50.0%

Overall, respondents indicated that, in exactly half of the 500 incidents reported on, censorship action was taken before a formal review. Librarians reported such action more frequently (55.0 percent) than administrators (45.4 percent). The reported rates of such action were also higher among building-level respondents in both groups (principals, 55.6 percent; building-level librarians, 66.7 percent) than among district-level respondents (superintendents, 40.1 percent; library-supervisors, 53.0 percent).

E. Resolution of Challenges

38. Did any school or community groups or individuals actively support or oppose the challenge?

Responses	Percentages (N=511*)
Yes	26.4%
No	73.6%

IF YES, please specify (check all that apply):

School board member(s)
Superintendent
District-level administrator(s)
Building-level administrator(s)
Librarian(s)
Teacher(s)
Teachers' organization
Parent(s)
Student(s)
Lawyer(s)
Clergy
Business person(s)
Senior citizen(s)
Civic leader(s)
Other group(s) or individual(s)

Exactly 26.4 percent of both the administrators' and the librarians' responses indicated that someone actively supported or opposed the challenge.

For each challenge reported on, respondents were asked, in the second part of the question, to identify the groups or individuals who took an active role in either supporting or opposing the challenge and to specify which side they were on. The individuals or groups most frequently cited as taking an active role ranked as follows (N = number of incidents):

Groups or Individuals Who Supported or Opposed Challenges	N
Librarians	103
Building-level administrators	89
Teachers	81
Parents	80
School board members	78
District-level administrators	58
Superintendents	52
Clergy	32
Students	30
Teachers' organizations	26

Nature of involvement

Librarians -- in 64.1 percent of the cases overall in which librarians were cited as taking an active part, they were reported to have opposed the challenge. The rate reported by administrators was slightly lower (60.9 percent) than that reported by librarians (66.7 percent).

Building-level administrators -- in 59.5 percent of the cases overall in which building-level administrators were cited, they were reported to have opposed the challenge. However, there was a considerable spread between the administrators' responses (67.3 percent) and the librarians' (50.0 percent) on this item.

Teachers -- in 61.7 percent of all cases in which teachers were cited, they were reported to have opposed the challenge. Administrators' and librarians' responses (65.0 and 57.6 percent, respectively) differed only slightly on this item.

Parents -- in 55.0 percent of the cases in which parents took an active part, they were reported to have supported the challenge. Administrators' and librarians' responses were closely comparable on this item.

School board members -- in 59.0 percent overall of the cases in which school board members were indicated as taking an active part, they were reported to have supported the challenge. Administrators' and librarians' responses (61.0 and 56.0 percent, respectively) differed only slightly.

District-level administrators -- in 58.6 percent of the cases overall in which district administrators were cited as involved, they were reported to have opposed the challenge. However, the two groups of respondents replied inversely on this item: administrators checked opposed the challenge in 67.6 percent of the cases, while librarians checked supported the challenge in 57.1 percent of the cases.

Superintendent -- in 57.7 percent of the cases overall in which superintendents were involved, they were reported to have supported the challenge. However, slightly over half (51.5 percent) of the administrators' responses indicated opposed the challenge, while nearly three-fourths (73.7 percent) of the librarians' responses indicated supported the challenge.

---

39. If a teacher, administrator, or other school personnel openly defended the use of the challenged material, what was his/her length of service prior to the challenge? (Please answer for the key person in each case.)

Responses	Percentages		
	A (N=144*)	L (N=118*)	A+L (N=262*)
Less than 2 years	11.1%	7.6%	9.5%
2-5 years	17.4%	33.9%	24.8%
5-15 years	52.8%	36.4%	45.5%
More than 15 years	18.8%	22.0%	20.2%

Before any conclusions can be drawn from these data, the distribution of length of service in the population should be considered.

---

40. On what ground(s) was the use of the challenged material defended? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Percentages (N=400*)
Legal/Constitutional	15.5%
Educational	75.8%
Other	8.7%

In the majority (75.8 percent) of the 400 cases reported on, respondents indicated that the use of the challenged material was defended on educational grounds. Legal/constitutional grounds were cited somewhat more often by librarians (19.0 percent) than by administrators (12.8 percent)--a difference which may be partly due to the "captive audience" legal distinctions between the classroom and the library.

---

41. Was anyone assigned to reevaluate the challenged material?

Responses	Percentages		
	A (N=247*)	L (N=218*)	A+L (N=465*)
Yes	60.3%	46.3%	53.8%
No	39.7%	53.7%	46.2%

IF YES, please specify (check all that apply):

School board member(s)
Superintendent
Assistant superintendent(s)
Director of curriculum and instruction
Director of media center
Curriculum specialist(s)
Instructional specialist(s)
Librarian(s)
Principal(s)
Assistant principal(s)
Department head(s)
Teacher(s)
Parent(s)
Student(s)
Civic leader(s)
Other(s)

In 60.3 percent of the administrators' cases someone was reported to have been assigned to evaluate the challenged material--as compared with only 46.3 percent of the librarians' cases. (The overall figure was 53.8 percent.)

The persons most frequently reported as being assigned to reevaluate challenged materials ranked, by frequency of responses, as follows:

As Reported by Administrators	%	As Reported by Librarians	%	As Reported by All Respondents	%
Principal(s)	17.5%	Librarian(s)	22.1%	Librarian(s)	17.4%
Librarian(s)	14.7%	Principal(s)	15.0%	Principal(s)	16.5%
Teacher(s)	14.5%	Teacher(s)	12.5%	Teacher(s)	13.7%
Parent(s)	7.7%	Director of media center	10.7%	Director of media center	8.6%
Director of media center	7.3%	Parent(s)	8.2%	Parent(s)	7.9%

42. Were the publisher (or producer) and/or author(s) given an opportunity to defend the material?

Responses	Percentages A (N=261*)	L (N=229*)	A+L (N=490*)
Yes	3.4%	11.8%	7.3%
No	96.6%	88.2%	92.7%

In the vast majority of incidents (92.7 percent overall), the publisher, producer, and/or author(s) were not given an opportunity to defend the challenged material. The negative response rate of the administrators was even higher--96.6 percent, as compared with 88.2 percent for the librarians.

43. At what administrative level was the challenge resolved?

Responses (ranked by percentages within each group of respondents):

Administrators (N=269*)	%	Librarians (N=224*)	%	All respondents (N=493*)	%
Principal	26.3%	Principal	34.0%	Principal	29.9%
Superintendent	24.2%	Librarian	17.0%	Superintendent	19.5%
Local School board	22.7%	Superintendent	13.8%	Local school board	16.2%
[More than one response checked]	7.8%	Local school board	8.5%	Librarian	10.5%
Other	7.4%	Department head	7.1%	Other	7.3%
Librarian	5.2%	Other	7.1%	[More than one response checked]	6.5%
Department head	2.6%	Case still pending	5.4%	Department head	4.7%
Teacher	1.9%	[More than one response checked]	4.9%	Case still pending	3.4%
Case still pending	1.9%	Teacher	2.2%	Teacher	2.0%

The percentages given above are based on the number of incidents reported on. In nearly 30 percent of the 493 cases cited, the challenge was resolved at the level of the principal; in nearly 20 percent of the cases, at the level of the superintendent; in just over 16 percent, at the local school board.

IF CASE IS STILL PENDING, please skip to question 46.

44. What was the final diposition of the incident with regard to the challenged material?

Responses (ranked by percentages)	Percentages (N=513*)
Challenge overruled	34.6%
Removal from school	22.2%
Alternate assignment offered at parents' request	8.4%
Use restricted to professional staff or certain ages or grades	7.0%
Removal from recommended list	4.3%
Parental permission required for use	3.1%
Use restricted to specific courses or classes	3.1%
Not reordered	3.1%
Destruction of material	2.7%
Moved from classroom to library	2.3%
Cutting, editing, or marking out of "objectionable" material	1.9%
Refusal to purchase	1.2%
Limited purchase	0.8%
Special edition ordered	0.6%
Other	4.7%

Administrators' and librarians' responses varied no more than a few percentage points on each item. However, the librarians' responses in nearly all cases tended toward more, rather than less, censorship action. The item for which the spread between responses from the two groups was greatest (5.5 percent) was "alternate assignment offered at parents' request" (administrators, 10.8 percent; librarians, 5.3 percent). Such action would be more likely to occur in relation to the classroom than the library.

Respondents indicated that in over a third (34.6 percent) of the incidents, the challenge was overruled. But in over a fifth (22.2 percent) of the incidents, they reported, the challenged material was removed from the school.

---

45. On what ground(s) was the resolution of the challenge based? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Percentages (N=448*)
Administrative	21.9%
Financial	1.3%
Legal/Constitutional	6.5%
Educational	64.1%
Other	6.2%

Administrators and librarians responded similarly. The percentages given above are for both groups combined. The majority of responses (64.1 percent) indicated that the resolution of the challenge was based on educational grounds; just over a fifth (21.9 percent) cited administrative grounds; while only 6.5 percent cited legal/constitutional grounds.

F. REPERCUSSIONS OF CHALLENGES

46. If use of the challenged material was at any point abridged in any way, was other material selected or acquired to replace it?

Responses	Percentages (N=358*)
Yes	9.8%
No	90.2%

IF YES, please identify.

The high negative response (90.2 percent) to this question offers further indication (see also questions 35 and 44 above) that the net effect of pressures on materials selection in the schools is to narrow the range and variety of materials available to students.

47. Did the incident result in the firing, resignation under pressure, removal, or failure to be reappointed (or re-elected) of any school personnel?

Responses	Administrators N	Administrators %	Librarians N	Librarians %	All Respondents N	All Respondents %
Yes	4	1.5	6	2.6	10	2.0
No	261	98.5	223	97.4	484	98.0
Total	265	100.0	229	100.0	494	100.0

IF YES, who was affected?

Responses	Administrators	Librarians
School board member(s)	--	--
Superintendent	--	2
Principal(s)	--	--
Assistant principal(s)	--	--
Department head(s)	--	--
Librarian(s)	1	--
Teacher(s)	2	--
Other(s)	1	--

In the four cases cited by administrators, two teachers, one librarian, and one other person were reported to be affected. In two of the six cases cited by librarians, superintendents were reported to be affected. In the other four cases, the respondents did not identify the personnel--a failure that may perhaps indicate a climate of fear. (See also question 49 below.)

Personnel were affected in 6 out of 229 (2.6 percent) of the incidents reported on by librarians, as opposed to only 4 out of 265 (1.5 percent) of those reported on by administrators--perhaps another indication that school censorship pressures are most intense in the library.

---

48. In your view, how has the incident affected the educational process in your school(s)?

Responses	Percentages (N=538*)
Too soon to tell	7.8%
No effect	57.4%
Influenced teaching content and/or style	7.1%
Influenced selection of materials	22.5%
Altered students' attitudes toward materials	3.2%
Other(s)	2.0%

Administrators answered "no effect" with greater frequency (61.9 percent of all responses) than librarians (52.5 percent). Otherwise, the two groups' responses were closely comparable. Percentages given above are based on the total number of responses for both groups combined.

Overall, respondents indicated that nearly a fourth of the cases cited (22.5 percent of all responses) "influenced selection of materials"; 7.1 percent of all responses indicated that challenges "influenced teaching content and/or style"; 3.2 percent, "altered students' attitudes toward materials."

---

49. Did court action result from the incident?

IF YES, please indicate which court:

State
Federal

Librarians reported that court action resulted from 4 out of the 224 challenges (1.8 percent) they cited--as compared to 2 out of the 264 challenges (0.8 percent) reported by administrators.

Both of the court actions reported by administrators were in state courts. One of the court actions reported by librarians was in federal court. The other three actions were not specified. Here again, one wonders whether the failure of librarian respondents to give specific information indicates a climate of fear or insecurity.

---

49. How has the case been decided?

Challenge to material sustained
Challenge to material overruled
Case still pending
Other

Computer data for this item are invalid, as a considerable number of respondents answered it even though they had checked NO in the first part of the question. Apparently, they were responding here on the outcome of the challenge, rather than on the outcome of a court case. (The original questionnaires would have to be pulled to retrieve this information.)

If possible, please give title and location of court action.

---

50. How have parents responded to the resolution of the challenge?

Responses	Percentages (N=472*)
No response	76.1%
Written protests	3.8%
Demonstrations	1.1%
Removed children from school	1.7%
Restricted children's access to controversial materials	7.2%
Restricted children's participation in certain class activities	4.0%
Other(s)	6.1%

Administrators' and librarians' responses were closely comparable (greatest spread was 5 percentage points).

Respondents indicated that in 76.1 percent of the incidents cited, parents made no response to the resolution of the challenge. In 7.2 percent of the incidents, respondents reported, parents "restricted children's access to controversial materials"; in 4.0 percent, "restricted children's participation in certain class activities." In eight incidents (1.7 percent of the total) cited by respondents, parents removed their children from school.

---

51. Have there been any other repercussions in the school(s) and/or the community?

Responses	Percentages (N=480*)
Yes	5.0%
No	95.0%

IF YES, please briefly list (attach additional sheet of paper, if necessary).

Administrators and librarians responded similarly. In all, they reported that in 456 out of 480 (95.0 percent) of the incidents cited, there were no other repercussions in the school(s) and/or the community. Respondents indicated that in 24 of the 480 incidents (5.0 percent) there were other repercussions.

---

52. Would you be willing to be contacted for a further, in-depth study in the follow-up phase of this project?

IF YES, please give your name and address in the space provided below.

	Percentages		
Responses	Administrators (N=1,110)	Librarians (N=482)	All Respondents (N=1,592)
Yes	30.5%	48.1%	35.9%
No	69.5%	51.9%	64.1%

Nearly half (48.1 percent) of the librarians who responded to this question indicated that they would be willing to be contacted in the follow-up phase of the project. Fewer than a third (30.5 percent) of the administrators so indicated.

PLEASE REMEMBER TO ENCLOSE, IF AVAILABLE, A COPY OF YOUR POLICY FOR SELECTING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND PROCEDURES FOR RECONSIDERING MATERIALS THAT HAVE BEEN CHALLENGED.

Only 613 administrators and 339 librarians responded to this item, as compared to the 666 administrators and 419 librarians who indicated, in answer to question 7, that they have a formal selection policy. Of the totals responding here, over half (54.6 percent) of the librarians indicated that they were enclosing a copy of their selection policy, reconsideration procedures, or both, while fewer than a third (32.0 percent) of the administrators so indicated.

Part II

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STATE-ADOPTION ADMINISTRATORS

A. Background Information

1. How long have you been in your present administrative post?

Responses	Frequency (N=22)
Less than 2 years	1
2-5 years	6
5-15 years	12
More than 15 years	3

Over two-thirds of the respondents indicated that they had been in their post more than 5 years. The respondent who answered "less than 2 years" indicated that she had assumed the position only a few weeks before receipt of the questionnaire and therefore felt unqualified to complete the other questions.

2. To the best of your knowledge, how does the rate of challenges to materials being considered for adoption for your state during the period since September 1, 1978, compare with the rate of challenges in the two-year period preceding September 1, 1978?

Responses	Frequency (N=20)
Lower	3
About the same	12
Higher	5
Not certain	--

Nearly one-fourth of the state-level respondents indicated that the rate of challenges since September 1, 1978, is higher than the rate for the preceding two-year period. One respondent, who did not check any of the printed responses for this question, wrote: "Challenges usually come at local level after adoption."

3. To your knowledge, in the period since September 1, 1978, have any challenges regarding the adoption of instructional materials affected either the adoption process or the materials adopted for your state?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	9
No	12

IF YES, please indicate which of the following has been affected (check all that apply):

Responses	Frequency
Curriculum content	3
Textbooks adopted	5
Supplementary materials adopted	2
Teaching methodology	1
Adoption policy	4
Adoption procedures	4
Other_____ (Please Specify)	3

Nearly half (9 out of 21) of the state-level respondents indicated that challenges since September 1, 1978, had affected the adoption process or the materials adopted. (Phone interviews indicated that a few respondents were careless about observing the September 1, 1978, cutoff date on this question, however, and that some of the effects they noted resulted from slightly earlier challenges.)

The breakdown of categories affected is listed above. The comments of the three respondents who checked "other" were quite varied:

One administrator, from one of the less populous Western states, wrote: "disruptive to process, but did not alter decision."

A respondent from a major Southern state noted: "The effect of challenges is a continuum--some of the results are negative but many are positive."

The third respondent, from a smaller Southern state, reported that State laws had been modified as a result of challenges.

---

4. Which of the following is included in your state adoptions? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Frequency: Basal Textbooks	Supplementary Print Materials	Nonprint Materials
Elementary	22	11	8
Secondary	19	9	5

Respondents indicated that half of the states "adopt" only basal materials (which sometimes include other than traditional textbooks).

As noted in the comments on question 5 below, however, basal "adoption" is far less restrictive in some states than in others.

---

5. Does your state allow for local options to use state funds to purchase materials not on state adoption lists?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	10
No	9

IF YES, what are the conditions or limitations for such purchases?

To put this question in perspective, it is important to note that the term "adoption" means very different things from state to state (see the Introduction and Overview of this report).

Respondents noted the following conditions:

"Up to 50% of the district categorical allocations may be spent for instructional materials not on state adoption. (Less than 15% is spent this way."

"Consumables excluded. Very little state money available."

"If the Commission doesn't list textbooks for a subject area, the local unit may go outside the Official List with the approval of the Commissioner of Education."

"Purchases are usually for instructional supplies/and or materials other than the Basal Textbook."

"No limitations so long as funding can be provided by LEAs. [local education agencies]." [Up to 20% of the state allocation can be used for materials not on the state list.]

"30% of textbook funds for pre-processed print and A-V materials." [Won't adopt or reimburse for any blank notebooks, tapes, etc.]

"Pilot materials--one to two years."

"State funds may be used to purchase non-textual supplementary materials."

"Must be approved by the State Board of Education."

"On pilot or field test basis before placing on an adoption list."

---

6. What was the 1979-1980 enrollment in your state's public schools?

The responses to this question are recorded in Table III. Some respondents gave only their total enrollment figure, without elementary-secondary breakdowns.

Table III

Public School Enrollment in States with Statewide Adoption Procedures
[unless otherwise indicated, figures are for 1979-1980]

State	Enrollment		
	Elementary	Secondary	Total
Alabama	410,000	350,000	760,000
Arizona	--	--	--
Arkansas	286,794	137,928	424,722
California	3,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000
Florida			1,542,897
Georgia			1,100,704
Idaho	110,782 (1-6)	91,976	202,758
Indiana	544,717 (K-6)	505,066	1,081,916 (incl. special ed. 32,133)
Kentucky	470,466	211,629	682,095
Louisiana (1978-79)	590,871	254,942	845,813
Mississippi	270,752	214,032	484,784
Nevada	110,000	50,000	160,000
New Mexico			260,000
North Carolina	813,500	363,000	1,176,500
Oklahoma	375,195	250,129	625,324
Oregon (1978-79)	307,970	149,843	457,813
South Carolina	--	--	--
Tennessee	641,522 (K-8)	269,825	911,347
Texas	1,646,000 (1-6)	1,359,000	3,005,000
Utah	183,000 (K-6)	140,000	323,000
Virginia	609,905	401,070	1,010,975
West Virginia (1978-79)	233,516	161,753	395,279
Totals	10,604,990	5,910,193	19,450,927

NOTE: Figures are given as reported by respondents, some of which are approximated or rounded figures.

B. Policies and Procedures

7. What controversial issues are referred to in your state's adoption policy statement? (Check all that apply.)

Responses (ranked from highest to lowest)	Frequency
Racism	13
Sexism	13
Religion	10
Sex and sexuality	10
Minority group representation	8
None	7
Ageism	7
Scientific theories _____ (Please specify)	4
Other(s) _____ (Please specify)	12

All four respondents who noted that their policy statements refer to scientific theories specified the issues of evolution vs. creation.

Other controversial issues reported in state adoption policies included the following (bracketed comments are based on follow-up phone interviews):

"Language." [Violence, Life Styles, Citizenship]
"No textbook shall be used...which speaks slightingly of the founders of the republic..."
"Represent fairly and accurately of the current achievements of all groups."
"General non-bias."
"Profanity and Obscenity."
[Citizenship, democracy, free enterprise, etc.]
"All are considered as a part of the evaluation process."
"Not demeaning to any individual or group." [Equal rights cultural diversity.]
"Environment, conservation, dangerous substances, etc."
"Color, national origin, ancestry, occupational."
"We are considering all of these."
"Free enterprise system."
"Handicapped."

8. Does your state inform parents and other state residents about its policies and procedures for adopting instructional materials?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	19
No	2

IF YES, how?

Only the Kentucky and Louisiana respondents indicated that their states do not inform parents and other residents about selection policies and procedures.

Provisions for informing state residents which were listed by other respondents were the following:

"Per inquiries or news articles."
"We have a handbook that is circulated to patrons upon request."
"Through media releases."
"We have developed slide/tape presentation and Handbook. These resources are available to local school systems for use in the community. We have done several radio and TV shows, and made presentations to a variety of professional and civic groups. We will be making a special for educational television during the coming year."
"State and district instructional materials councils must have lay members--meetings are open and advertised--district displays of material being considered."
"Upon request and through county boards of education."
"News media--local school superintendents."
"Handbook-news releases."
"One parent serves on each adoption committee."
"Committee (adoption) report, newspapers, news magazine."
"Mailings and news releases."
"Proclamation calling for bids on textbooks--advertisement in several newspapers of the call--statewide news release."

C. Evaluation and Adoption of Textbooks and Instructional Materials

9. Who is responsible for evaluating and recommending textbooks and other instructional materials for your state adoptions?

Responses	Frequency
One committee for all materials	8
Separate committees for different disciplines	10
Other_____ (Please specify)	5

Arizona was included in this question, with information taken from the state guidelines. One respondent checked both "separate committees for different disciplines" and "other" (which explains why there were a total of 23 responses, rather than 22)--specifying "subject area supervisory personnel of Department of Education." The other four respondents who checked "other" specified the following:

"Elementary textbook committee only."

"Subject area supervisory personnel of Department of Education. Curriculum and Instruction committee of State Board of Education."

"Members of the Commission utilize different committees each year to evaluate the textbooks."

"Classroom teachers and districts."

"Seven commissioners--each with up to 100 committees."

---

10. Is the composition of your adoption committee(s) stipulated in your adoption procedures?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	18
No	2

IF YES, please indicate both the breakdown and the total number of members per committee:

College or university personnel
School administrators
Supervisors
Curriculum consultants
Classroom teachers
Civic leaders
Parents
Other(s)_____
(Please Specify)

The range of responses here was very broad. See the discussion of adoption procedures in the Introduction and Overview of this report.

---

11. Are provisions made for publishers' or nonprint producers' representatives to present proposed submissions to your state adoption committee(s)?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	19
No	3

IF YES, how? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Frequency
Group hearings (with other representatives) before committee	3
Individual hearings before committee	12
Private meetings with individual committee members	10
Other (Please specify)	1

The respondent who checked "other" noted: "All hearings are open--with few exceptions, competitors do not elect to be present for others' presentations."

All but the Nevada, Indiana, and Utah respondents indicated that provisions were made for publishers' representatives to present submissions to the state adoption committee(s).

12. Are provisions made for special interest groups to present their views on textbooks and instructional materials to the state adoption committee(s)?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	14
No	7

IF YES, what sort of provisions?

Two-thirds of the respondents indicated that their state made provisions for special-interest groups to present their views to the state adoption committee(s). The following provisions were noted:

"Request received at least two weeks in advance or written presentation received two weeks in advance of hearing."
"Elementary only--upon request."
"Public hearings provide an opportunity for these groups to address the textbook commission."

"Contact committee, adoption committees."

"Correspondence may (or may not) be presented by chairman to committee."

"Written and oral input and public hearings."

"Hearings before the state textbook committee and Commissioner of Education."

"By appointment and request through the textbook administrator for Idaho."

"Upon request and being placed on the agenda."

"An open hearing before the State Board Subcommittee on instructional material prior to adoption."

"Complainants are required to submit to the Commission their objections (a statement form is being developed) in writing. Complaints are examined and the individual or group may be invited to present in person their concerns at the next meeting of the State Textbook Commission. A formal policy and procedure is being developed for approval by the Commission during 1980."

"To committee, commission and State Board of Education."

---

13. Are provisions made for authors, publishers, or producers to defend materials challenged during the adoption process?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	12
No	7

IF YES, how?

Responses	Frequency
In writing only	2
In person, before committee or individuals responsible for reconsideration	7
Other _____ (Please specify)	6

More than two-thirds of the respondents indicated that provisions are made for publishers to defend materials challenged during the adoption process. In addition to the provisions specified above, respondents checking "other" noted the following:

"Special-interest groups present challenges prior to publishers' presenting materials to Committee--Publishers/authors respond during presentation."

"No formal provision--but all meetings are open in Indiana."

"No challenges have been made."

"Depends on situation."

"Would be made if needed."

"Coordinator intercedes for publisher; if necessary, coordinator contacts publisher."

---

14. If potentially controversial materials are adopted in your state, are any provisions made to explain them to parents and other lay members of the community at the time of adoption?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	9
No	11

IF YES, what sort of provisions?

Nearly half of the respondents indicated that their state made no provisions to explain potentially controversial materials to parents and other lay citizens at the time of adoption. (Some of these respondents noted that such provisions were more likely at the local level, where final selection occurs.)

The respondents answering YES to this question specified the following provisions:

"This is a local responsibility in our state."
"Adoption decisions are made at the state level. Purchase decisions are made at the local level. All materials must be evaluated according to locally adopted policies prior to purchase."
"All committee meetings are 'open meetings.'"
"District assumes responsibility."
"Not a state function--counties provide this."
"This is left to local districts."
"Written information to superintendents."
"We try to avoid controversial materials--i.e., 'four-letter words,' etc."
"Handled as the situation arises."
"Each school district is sent a review of adopted materials by TEA."
"Patrons are asked to file a written grievance."
"Local districts select from state list of 10 books, and have sole responsibility for textbook use at local level."
"Copies of evaluations are made available on request along with publisher responses."

IF, IN THE PERIOD SINCE SEPTEMBER 1, 1978, THERE HAVE BEEN NO CHALLENGES TO INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR STATE ADOPTION, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 30.

D. Challenges to Instructional Materials under Consideration for State Adoption

15. In the period since September 1, 1978, what has been the extent of challenges to instructional materials under consideration for state adoption in the various disciplines?

Responses		Frequency			
		Number of Challenges			
		None	Few	Average	Many
(a)	Elementary-level Language Arts	1	2	2	0
(b)	Secondary-level Language Arts	1	1	2	1
(c)	Foreign Languages	4	0	0	0
(d)	Social Studies	0	5	2	2
(e)	Science	0	5	1	2
(f)	Math	3	1	0	0
(g)	Health Education	2	3	1	1
(h)	Other _____ (Please specify)	1	1	0	2

The number of responses in each category are given above. More challenges were reported in relation to social studies and math than in the other disciplines. However, responses to this question (as well as the next) would have been dependent largely on each state's particular adoption cycle during the recent period. Since most states have adoption cycles of about five years, the period "since September 1, 1978" defined in the questionnaire would not have covered the whole spectrum of subjects in each state. It may therefore be inappropriate to draw any firm conclusions, from these data, about the relative frequency of challenges in the various disciplines.

16. What were alleged to be the objectionable aspects of the challenged materials? (Check all that apply.)

Responses (ranked by frequency)	Frequency
"Secular humanism"	7
Darwinism, evolution	7
Scientific theories	6
Criticism of U.S. history	6
Values clarification	6
"Undermining of traditional family"	6
Atheistic or agnostic views	6
Anti-traditional/antiestablishment views	5
Negative or pessimistic view	5
Moral relativism or situation ethics	5
Religious bias	4
Homosexuality	4
Explicit discussion of drugs and drug abuse	4
Invasion of personal privacy	4
Emphasis on psychology or feelings	4
Sexism	3
Obscenity	3
"Dirty words"	3
Abortion	3
Violence	3
Profanity	3
Explicit representation of sex	3
Internationalism	3
Death and dying	3
Racism	2
Minority representation	2
Nudity	2
The occult	2
Pagan studies	2
"Questionable" or "subversive" authors	2
Ageism	1
Realism	1
Atrocities	1
Substandard English usage or dialect	1
Ethnic studies	--
Other(s)	7

The wording of this item was kept identical with question 25 on the local-level survey, so that data from the two sets of respondents could be compared. Both local and state-level respondents indicated that the range of aspects challenged is extremely broad. It should be noted, however, that on the state level the ranking of responses would have been at least partly influenced by the particular subjects up for adoption in the recent period. For example, challenges related to Darwinism and

evolution are most likely to occur during the biology or science adoption cycles--or, in some states, social studies (the creationist view of the origin of life is sometimes incorporated into the social studies curriculum).

That caveat should be kept in mind when one compares the ranking of responses to this question by state- and local-level survey participants. Whereas the broad moral issues of sex, obscenity, and profanity dominated the responses on the local level, on the state level such challenges were reported less frequently than the more complex philosophical-moral-religious issues of "secular humanism," evolution, etc., which were cited rather infrequently on the local level.

Please respond, in questions 17-28, ON THE CHALLENGES WHICH HAVE CREATED THE GREATEST CONTROVERSY. Treat each challenge as a separate case. (You will probably find it easiest to answer the questions, in order, for one case at a time, rather than for all cases at once.)

IF YOU WISH TO RESPOND ON MORE THAN THREE CHALLENGES, please photocopy the balance of this questionnaire for additional responses.

17. Please identify the challenged items, and indicate to what discipline each belongs (giving the appropriate letter from the left of the list in question 15).

The majority of respondents indicated that state-level challenges during the adoption process generally involve all the titles under consideration, and that it would be misleading to cite specific challenged items. This is in marked contrast to the situation on the local level, where respondents indicated that challengers usually do single out specific titles.

One state-level respondent enclosed a sample list of objections presented by a parent during science and health adoption hearings. The objections run to dozens of typewritten pages and touch on most of the titles submitted for adoption during that cycle.

Only one respondent listed specific titles on the questionnaire, as follows: "Selected as examples: Anderson et al, Silver Burdett Social Studies series, 1979. Ryder, Contemporary Living, First edition, 1979. (Home Economics). Gross et al, American Citizenship: The Way We Govern, First Edition, 1979."

Another respondent enclosed a list of titles challenged during a recent social studies adoption (see Appendix B).

---

18. What was the grade level of the challenged material? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Frequency
K & Lower elementary	3
Upper elementary	7
Junior high	8
Senior high	9

Here, as on the local level, responses indicate that the frequency of challenges increases with increasing grade level.

19. To which part(s) of the material did the challenger(s) object? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Frequency
Illustrations or images [only]	--
Text or narration [only]	7
[Both responses checked]	4

20. Who initiated the challenge?

Responses	Frequency
Individual, representing him/herself	6
Individual, representing a group	11
Group	6

Please specify (check all that apply):

Responses	Frequency
School board member(s)	--
District-level administrator(s)	--
Building-level administrator(s)	--
Librarian(s)	--
Teacher(s)	1
Student(s)	--
Parent(s)	8
Clergy	2
Community resident(s)	5
P.T.A.	--
Other local group(s) _____	6
State group(s) _____	4
National group(s) _____	5
Other group(s) or individual(s) _____ (Please specify)	1

In approximately two-thirds of the recent state-level incidents cited by respondents, the challenge was initiated by either a group or an individual representing a group. This is in marked contrast with the situation on the local level, where over three-fourths of the recent challenges cited were reported to be initiated by individuals acting independently.

Note, too, that 5 out of 32 responses indicated that national groups were involved in initiating the challenge. The influence of national groups was also cited by a number of respondents in other contexts of the survey as well (see question 23, for example).

---

21. Did any of the local media report or editorialize on the challenge?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	13
No	--

IF YES, what position was taken?

Responses	Frequency
Remained neutral on the issue	10
Supported adoption of the challenged materials	2
Opposed adoption of the challenged materials	1
Positions varied	1
Other(s) _____ (Please specify)	1

In all of the recent state-level challenges cited by respondents, there was some media coverage. In the majority of cases (10 out of 15), a neutral stance was maintained.

---

22. Had the person(s) who initiated the challenge read or viewed the challenged material in its entirety?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	6
No	2
Not Sure	6

---

23. Did the person(s) challenging the material refer to arguments or viewpoints developed by individuals or groups from outside the state?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	10
No	4
Not Sure	--

Respondents indicated that the views of out-of-state groups or individuals were referred to in over two-thirds of the recent challenges cited (see the Introduction and Overview for further discussion of this issue).

24. Which of the following did the challenger(s) seek to do?

Responses	Frequency
Expand the information and viewpoints in the the materials used and/or introduce new points of view	10
Limit the information and viewpoints in the materials used	9

In contrast with the situation on the local level, where just under 95 percent of the challenges sought to limit information and viewpoints, slightly over half of the recent challenges cited by state-level respondents sought, at least in part, to expand information and viewpoints in the materials under consideration.

It is important to note that groups like the Creation Research Society generally advocate the addition or inclusion of their own views or materials, rather than the removal of opposing views such as evolutionary theory.

E. Resolution of Challenges

25. Did any school or community groups or individuals actively support or oppose the challenge at the state level?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	9
No	4

26. What was the final decision with regard to the challenged material?

Responses	Frequency
Case still pending	--
Adopted as basal	11
Adopted as supplementary	1
Not adopted	3
Special edition required for state	--
Other	4

Respondents who checked "other" specified the following outcomes:
"All were adopted."
"Changes required."

---

27. Did court action result from the challenge?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	--
No	14

Though respondents indicated that none of the cited recent challenges (since September 1, 1978) resulted in court action, they stated (during follow-up phone interviews) that court actions had resulted from somewhat earlier challenges, and that legislative action was prompted by some of the recent challenges (see question 28, below).

---

28. Have there been any other repercussions at the state level?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	2
No	12

The two respondents answering YES noted the following repercussions:

Tennessee: "The State Textbook Law was changed in 1980 to include three lay citizens as members of the State Textbook Commission. A resolution was [also] passed to study the state textbook selection process and possibly introduce other legislative changes in the 1981 session of the General Assembly."

Georgia: "Fundamentalist groups have lobbied for the introduction of a bill in the State legislature requiring that equal time be given to the teaching of their views in the schools. The bill was killed in committee last year, but will be presented again this year.

---

29. In your view, have such challenges affected the educational process in your state?

Responses	Frequency
Yes	5
No	--
Not certain	--

IF YES, how? (Check all that apply.)

Responses	Frequency
Influenced content and/or style of teaching	2
Influenced selection of materials	6
Altered students' attitudes toward materials	--
Other(s) _____ (Please specify)	5

[NOTE: Respor es for the second part of this question total more than 5 because some respondents reported on more than one challenge.]

Other repercussions specified by respondents were the following:
"Made people more aware of importance of instructional material."
"Created bad publicity and adverse opinions about textbooks and education in general."
"Influenced material submitted for adoption." [I.e., Publishers have been influenced to change material.]

---

30. PLEASE INDICATE IF A COPY OF YOUR STATE'S ADOPTION POLICY IS ENCLOSED OR UNAVAILABLE.

Responses	Frequency
Enclosed	19
Unavailable	2

The states which did not have current adoption policy statements when the survey questionnaire was circulated were Tennessee and New Mexico. The respondent from Tennessee noted that a policy based on the ALA model will be approved this year. The respondent from New Mexico stated that they were in the process of revising their adoption handbook. Both participants said they would send copies of their guidelines when ava''able. (New Mexico's handbook has since been rece'ved.)

The remaining 19 respondents sent copies of their state guidelines, policies, and procedures governing book and materials adoption. These are in the possession of the AAP.

Appendix A

Letter to AAP from State-Adoption Administrator

[The following letter was sent to AAP with the completed state-level survey questionnaire.]

July 2, 1980

Mr. Townsend Hoopes
Association of American Publishers
One Park Avenue
New York, New York 10016

Dear Mr. Hoopes:

I am pleased to see that the Association of American Publishers is responding to what we in Tennessee see as the beginning of a powerful movement by the "New Right" to dismantle the public education system. Perhaps I am over-reacting to this situation, but it represents a continuing source of concern by many educators here and across the nation. I am forwarding copies of two recent articles from professional journals which may provide some further information on the New Right and its objectives.

When your survey arrived I discussed it with Miss Christine Brown, Program Manager for Libraries and Media Services, and we agreed that since we do not have a state approved list of library books, our responses would apply only to textbooks. In completing the survey, I felt that instead of trying to respond about each complaint, it would be easier to enclose a copy of each evaluation submitted by the Pro-Family Forum.

If I can be of further service please contact me.

Sincerely yours,

R. Jerry Rice, Director
Textbook Services

RJR:ask

Enclosure: [copies of the following:
Gene Bryant, "Entanglement by the New Right," Tennessee Education Association (Tennessee Teacher, April, 1980).
J. Charles Park, "Preachers, Politics, and Public Education," Phi Delta Kappan, May 1980.]

Appendix B

Sample List of Titles Challenged during a Recent Statewide Social Studies Adoption

During recent adoption proceedings in one Western state, the evaluation committee recommended, on the basis of the objections raised by a group of citizens, that the titles listed below be removed from the list of titles proposed for adoption. After a hearing by the State Board of Education and reconsideration by a blue ribbon committee appointed by the Board, all the titles were retained on the State list.

Publisher	Title
Allyn & Bacon	Decision-Making in American Government
American Book Co.	American Society
Benefic Press	You the Citizen
Fearon-Pitman	The Young America Series
Ginn	American Political Behavior
Globe	Minorities U.S.A. Our American Minorities The United States The Earth
Holt, Rinehart & Winston	A History of the United States to 1877 A History of the United States from 1877
Laidlaw Brothers	Our American Government and Political System
McGraw-Hill/Webster	The Impact of Our Past
Prentice Hall, Inc.	American Government: Comparing Political Experiences
Rand McNally & Co.	The Promise of Democracy These United States
Science Research Associates	People in Groups We, the American Women Governing Your Life United States Government: The People Decide
Scott Foresman	America! America!
Silver Burdett	Our Legal Hertiage
West Publishers	Youth Attitudes and the Police Juvenile Problems and the Law